A Revolutionary Crucible:
French Radicals, Foreign Expatriates, and Political Exiles in the Paris Commune

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Christopher John Marshall

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

M.J. Maynes, Advisor

September, 2014

Acknowledgements

Like any undertaking, this dissertation would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of many great people. This project would have never been realized without the wisdom, encouragement, and patience of my advisor M.J. Maynes. Gary Cohen, through both his scholarly example and kindness, contributed greatly to this dissertation's completion. While numerous faculty members at the University of Minnesota aided me in my scholarly journey, I want to give particular thanks to Patricia Lorcin, August Nimtz, Ron Aminzade, Theo Stavrou, and Tom Wolfe for their help over the years. I would also be remiss if I did not recognize my great colleagues at the University of Wisconsin-Stout for their support. Dick Tyson, Bob Zeidel, Nels Paulson, Kim Zagorski, the amazing Chris Freeman, and the much-missed Alec Kirby (everyone at Stout really) all assisted me in different but vital ways in completing this phase of my academic career.

I would never have undertaken an academic career in History without the intercession of Tamara Whited, my advisor at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Her mentorship, and her faith in my capacities, despite my doubts, proved a turning point in my professional life, for which I am immensely grateful.

Every task in life requires a little help from one's friends, and this dissertation was no different. I have been very fortunate to have a great band of comrades that provided advice, criticism and everything in between; thus a big thank to Adam Blackler, Will Cremer, Greg Halfond, Eric Otremba, Mollie Madden, Eric Roubinek, and Tim Smit for tolerating me for so long. A special thank you goes to Peter Hayward and Edward

Snyder, who served as intellectual sounding boards, measured critics, and crisis managers over my years of writing.

I also wish to thank the archivists and staff at the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* and the *Archives Nationales* for their assistance in my research. Further, compiling the necessary material for this dissertation would have been impossible without the terrific people at the University of Minnesota's Wilson Library, particularly the Interlibrary Loan staff.

I have come to believe that love and support are just as necessary to any academic project as archives and monographs. My sister Beth and her husband Rob did much with the constant question "when will you be done again?" to get me to this point. Nina and Viktor, my soon to be parents-in-law, have opened their home to me, providing me with a family here in Minnesota. My Mom and Dad, whom I consider the best at these respective roles in history, have been a constant source of support in every possible way and I love them very much.

Finally, I am truly fortunate to have had my great love Valerie with me during this entire process. Critic, supporter, editor, translator, friend, partner, it is by no means understatement when I say that I could never have done this (nor would have wanted to) without her. My love for her transcends the infinite.

To my soul mate Valeriya

In your face space coyote!

Table of Contents

Introduction

The struggle to define the Paris Commune's place in history began only two days after the last barricades fell at a small gathering in London. On May 30, 1871, Karl Marx stood before the General Council of the International Working Men's Association and read an address that combined in equal parts analysis, critique, indictment, and memorial. This stirring polemic, published soon after as *The Civil War in France*, rapidly established itself (and remains) the starting point for all inquiry into the Commune's significance. Perhaps most poignant is its rhetorical crescendo, which serves both as the Commune epitaph and a celebration of its achievement:

> Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators' history has already been nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.[1]

This marked the beginning of the Paris Commune's elevation to the sacred for the Left. Only nine years after the Commune's defeat, Parisian radicals held their first annual pilgrimage to the *Mur des Fédérés* in Père Lachaise cemetery. Friedrich Engels, in his 1891 preface to *The Civil War in France*, asserted that the Paris Commune constituted the prototype for the dictatorship of the proletariat, thus establishing the Commune as a central element in the Marxist ideological canon. Lenin, building upon this, employed the Commune as both a model and cautionary tale in planning and

[1]Karl Marx, "The Civil War in France," in Karl Marx and V.I. Lenin, *Civil War in France: The Paris Commune*, ed. Nikita Fedorovsky, (New York: International, 1993): 9-85, at 81–82.

realizing the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.[2] This so firmly established the Commune's place in the Soviet/Communist mythos that when Yuri Gagarin became the first human in space in April 1961 he carried aboard Vostok 1 one of the red flags of the Commune, thus bringing Marx's analogy of the Communards "storming the heavens" to fruition. From Marx's initial intervention onward, radicals framed the Commune within a discourse focused upon the future. Thus, 1871 marked a departure point toward realizing the political and social vision articulated but not achieved by the Communards.

While this discourse continued well into the twentieth century, the decades immediately following the Commune saw several surviving participants contribute their reflections and conclusions. Among those writing of their experiences was the Hungarian Leo Frankel. During the Commune, despite his foreign origins, Frankel participated actively within the highest circles of leadership and served as the Commune's Commissioner of Labor and Exchange until its violent demise at the hands of the French Army. Writing in 1877 while serving as the editor of the Hungarian workers' journal *Munkas Heti-Kronika*, Frankel characterized the Commune in terms very similar to Marx, asserting that "the revolution whose birth was commemorated in Montmartre on March 18th, 1871 was not just one more revolution coming after so many others; it was a new kind of revolution." Continuing in a similar vein, Frankel proclaimed "the great ideal that animated the defenders of Paris will continue to spread

[2]So great was Lenin's emphasis on learning from the failures of the Paris Commune that a popular tale, almost certainly apocryphal, developed that describes him dancing in the Moscow snow when the Bolshevik government outlasted the Commune's duration.

until the day when it will lead the oppressed to final victory…for us, March 18th signals the dawn of a new world, a new society."[3]

While Frankel's words aimed at furthering the discourse on the Commune's significance to the international socialist movement's future trajectory, the prominence of his participation serves to highlight a transitional moment in Paris's history as the "revolutionary capital" of Europe. The Paris Commune of 1871, viewed by Marx and subsequent generations of revolutionary socialists as the prototype for the dictatorship of the proletariat, also marked the apex of Paris's tenure as the revolutionary center for international radicals. While inaugurating "a new dawn" for the transnational radical/socialist movement, May 1871 also served as a *fini* for those movements' active ties to Paris. Frankel's participation in the Commune, alongside Elisabeth Dmitrieff, Jaroslav Dombrowski, and other non-French radicals, represented the culmination of a process of ideological evolution, exchange, and formulation that began with the Great Revolution in 1789 and continued throughout all of Paris's nineteenth-century revolutionary manifestations prior to 1871.

By focusing on these three non-French radicals as case studies, this dissertation demonstrates how the Paris Commune, by building on ideological, political, and social developments within Paris since the French Revolution, marked a pivotal moment in Europe's transnational radical discourse, particularly for foreign radicals operating within the French capital. While the cosmopolitan and universalistic language that characterized the French Revolution initially drew international adherents to Paris, the realities of the

[3]Reproduced in Tibor Ereny, "La Commune de Paris et le Mouvement Ouvrier Hongrois," *Europe* 29 (Apr. 1, 1951): 180.

Revolution, particularly after the nationalist shift in 1792, undercut the promise of a true transnational discourse. However, Paris's nineteenth-century revolutionary cycle, beginning in 1830, once again drew international radicals with the promise of providing a site capable of fostering their own ideological goals. The ensuing period between 1830 and 1848 saw émigré radicals, drawn at first by Paris's revolutionary legacy, engage in a process of interaction and negotiation that began fusing Paris's revolutionary potency with new transnational discourses, particularly that of socialism. Thus, when Paris's February uprising inaugurated the Revolutions of 1848, non-French radicals viewed the city's revolution as transnational, adaptable to particular national conditions and aspirations, and thus exportable, either ideologically or by means of direct military action. While both of these efforts, along with the Revolution within France itself, ultimately fell to reactionary response, 1848 demonstrated to non-French radicals Paris's capacity to foster transnational revolutionary ideology. It also further illustrated the need to first see revolution in the French capital consolidated before attempting to spread revolution to their respective homelands.

The 1864 founding of the International Workingman's Association further bolstered Paris's *longue durée* development as a revolutionary center for non-French radicals prior to the Commune's establishment. This organization deepened transnational ties between European radicals and reinforced the perceived interconnectedness of seemingly national-specific revolutionary events. The International would count nearly all of the Commune's non-French participants among its members, including both Leo Frankel and Elisabeth Dmitrieff, while most non-members, like Jaroslav Dombrowski,

possessed both personal and ideological ties to its associates. Inspired by this transnational discourse and influenced by Paris's powerful revolutionary legacy, these three émigré radicals' participation in the Paris Commune was characterized by balancing their personal ideological goals with the realities of operating within a diverse political community. In the three cases examined in this dissertation, negotiation and compromise constituted an essential part of Leo Frankel's, Elisabeth Dmitrieff's, and Jaroslav Dombrowski's experiences operating within the Paris Commune's various networks, which were characterized by divergent and often competing interests. Building on the model of earlier generations of revolutionary émigrés, these non-French radicals devoted themselves to the cause of the Commune hoping that its success would ignite a transformative revolutionary tide, fired by Paris's revolutionary tradition transcending its national boundaries, which would enable them to realize their respective ideological aspirations.

Émigré Radicals in the Literature of the Commune and Revolutionary Paris

In the Paris Commune's historiography, foreign radicals despite their prominent participation garner only brief and sporadic attention. Moreover, little of this focus deals with the question of their nationality and motivation in relation to their contributions. Stuart Edwards, whose excellent *The Paris Commune, 1871* constitutes one of the standard workers on the subject, addresses this issue in only a few brief sentences; he cites the Communards' internationalism or, in the case of Dombrowski and his fellow Polish officers, patriotism as fully accounting for the foreign presence within their ranks. Other works follow a similar approach, focusing primarily on the involvement of these

individuals in the context of the Commune's development and operation.[4] The only monograph that directly addresses the question of non-French radicals' contributions to the Commune is Woodford McClellan's *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune*. However, as the title indicates, McClellan focuses primarily on Russians with some attention given to other Slavic (specifically Polish) exiles. Moreover, though providing an excellent synthesis of the Russian radical diaspora in the years before the Commune, the bulk of his account concentrates on their participation and interactions with the First International, with only one of ten chapters devoted exclusively to the Russian/Slavic Communards.[5] Beyond McClellan's work, the only other study devoted to the Commune's foreign participants is contained in a special issue of the journal *Cahiers Internationaux, Revue Internationale du Monde du Travail*, published in May 1950. This consists of a series of articles focused on Russian participants, Polish participants, and one piece specifically devoted to Leo Frankel. While containing useful background materials drawn from the Soviet archives, these articles present narrative rather than analysis.[6]

This omission within the literature on the Paris Commune becomes even starker when viewed in the context of the historiography of foreign radicals in Paris since 1789.

---

[4]Stuart Edwards, *The Paris Commune, 1871* (New York: Quadrangle, 1971), 204, 233. For other examples of this rather brief treatment of foreign Communards and their motivations, see Pierre Milza, *L'Année terrible: La Commune mars-juin 1871* (Paris: Perrin, 2009), 221–27; Jacques Rougerie, *Paris insurgé: la Commune de 1871* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995), 97; Robert Tombs, *The Paris Commune, 1871* (London: Longman, 1999), 81, 156; David A. Shafer, *The Paris Commune: French Politics, Culture and Society at the Crossroads of the Revolutionary Tradition and Revolutionary Socialism* (New York: Palgrave, 2005), 124; and Martin Johnson, *The Paradise of Association: Political Culture and Popular Organizations in the Paris Commune of 1871* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 66.

[5]See Woodford McClellan, *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (London: Frank Cass, 1979), 150–78.

[6]Jean Bruhat, Emile Tersen, Hélène Gosset, and Vassili Soukomline, "Le Mouvement Ouvrier International et la Commune de Paris," *Cahiers Internationaux, Revue Internationale du Monde du Travail* 16 (May 1950): 35–62.

Several works focus specifically on the question during the Great Revolution, most notably Albert Mathiez's *La Révolution et les Etrangers: cosmopolitisme et défense nationale*. While devoted to foreign radicals during the French Revolution, Mathiez's analysis highlights the tensions between internationalism and patriotism that characterized all of Paris's uprisings during its century of revolutions, including the Commune.[7] Paris's resurgence as Europe's revolutionary center for international radicals between 1830 and 1848 also receives treatment in several works, including Lloyd Kramer's case study approach *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830–1848,* which inspired in part the approach of this dissertation.[8] The lack of any comparable studies on the Paris Commune's non-French radicals clearly indicates the need for an intervention of the sort intended by this project.

Beyond the broader place of émigré radicals in the literatures of the Commune and Paris's revolutionary tradition, none of the three specific subjects of this study have been examined with emphasis on their histories and motivations in relation to their participation in the Commune. More strikingly, despite serving in key positions of authority in Europe's bloodiest civil uprising of the nineteenth century, two of the three individuals addressed in this dissertation have scarcely been researched by scholars in

---

[7]Albert Mathiez, *La Révolution et les Etrangers: cosmopolitisme et défense nationale* (Paris: La Renaissance du livre, 1918). Other works addressing the question of foreigners, both as radical participants and common citizens, during the French Revolution include Sophie Wahnich, *L'impossible Citoyen: L'étranger dans le discours de la Révolution française* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997) and Michael Rapport, *Nationality and Citizenship in Revolutionary France: The Treatment of Foreigners 1789–1799* (New York: Oxford UP, 2000).

[8]Lloyd S. Kramer, *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830–1848* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988). Though not focused exclusively on the question of non-French radicals, Mark Traugott, *The Insurgent Barricade* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2010) contains a highly valuable section focused on the contributions and actions of émigré radicals in 1848, organized by nationality. See also Georges Bourgin, "1848 en Europe," in *1848: Le livre du centenaire*, ed. Charles Moulin, 81-108 (Paris: Atlas, 1948).

any context. Despite being both the Commune's Commissioner of Labor and Exchange (largely considered its most effective department) and the highest ranking foreigner within its ranks, not a single scholarly work in French focuses on Leo Frankel other than the eleven page article mentioned above. Indeed, only scholars in Frankel's native Hungary have engaged in any serious historical inquiries, all of which were conducted under Communism and thus bear the burden of its influences. Of these, Magda Aranyossi's 1956 book and János Jemnitz's 1972 article, with their access to the archives in Budapest, provide accounts both useful and showing only a limited taint of Soviet dogma.[9] However, both also understandably focus substantial portions of their accounts on Frankel's post-Commune activities for the International and in his homeland. Thus, no modern account of Leo Frankel, particularly one with an emphasis on his role in the Commune, exists.

A similar lacuna exists in terms of the scholarship on Jaroslav Dombrowski. There are two monographs, one Polish and one Soviet, both written under Communism. The latter, written by Daniil Alexandrovich Granin, was published in a French translation in 1956.[10] Like the works on Frankel, Granin's benefits from access to Polish and Soviet archives. Interestingly, no Polish scholars have written on Dombrowski since 1989, a fact likely stemming in part from the Communist regime's heavy symbolic use of the Communard, including placing his likeness on the 200-Złoty banknote during the 1970s.

---

[9]Magda Aranyossi, *Leo Frankel* (Berlin, Dietz, 1957) and János Jemnitz, "Leo Frankel," *International Review of Social History* 17 (April 1972): 391–94. While Aranyossi's work makes the requisite references to the works of Lenin and other prominent Communists within the text, his account makes extensive use of the archives in Budapest and the holdings of Paris's *Archives Nationales*, as well as published primary sources on the Commune.

[10]Daniel Granine, *Dombrowsky*, trans. Georges Arout (Paris: Les Éditeurs Français Réunis, 1956) and Włodzimierz Rożałowski, *Wspomnienia o generale Jarosławie Dąbrowskim* (Wydawn: Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej, 1951)

Despite being hailed as the "most able soldier"[11] of a government locked in combat for the entirety of its existence, Dombrowski, like Frankel, remains largely context-less and confined to a few brief paragraphs in the literatures of both the Commune and Paris's émigré radicals.

Elisabeth Dmitrieff constitutes the one exception in terms of the treatment of non-French radicals in the existing literature. Two major French studies, Yvonne Singer-Lecocq's *Rouge Elisabeth* and Sylvie Braibant's *Elisabeth Dmitrieff: aristocrate et pétroleuses*, provide extensive and well-researched biographies of the Russian feminist radical. Edith Thomas's groundbreaking 1963 study of women and the Commune, *The Women Incendiaries*, devotes almost as much attention to Dmitrieff as it does to the Commune's renowned "Red Virgin" Louise Michel. More recently, Carolyn Eichner chose Dmitrieff, along with André Léo and Paule Mink, as part of her case study *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune*. Gay L. Gullickson also touches on Dmitrieff's contributions in his study of women's role in the Commune, *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Paris Commune*.[12] However, while these works collectively present a substantial picture of Dmitrieff's life and work during the Commune, their analysis focuses primarily on her role as a radical/socialist feminist. The question of her nationality in relation to her work for the Commune receives little

---

[11]Edwards, 382.

[12]Yvonne Singer-Lecocq, *Rouge Elisabeth* (Paris: Editions Stock, 1977); Sylvie Braibant, *Elisabeth Dmitrieff: aristocrate et pétroleuses* (Paris: Belfond, 1993); Edith Thomas, *The Women Incendiaries* (New York: George Braziller, 1966); Carolyn J. Eichner, *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2004); and Gay L. Gullickson, *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Commune* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996). In addition to these works Ivan Knizhnik-Vetrov, *Russkie deiatel'nitsky Pervogo Internatsionala I Parizhskoi Kummuny* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1964) contains several pieces of biographical information not found in other sources despite its heavy use of Marxist-Leninist dogma in the text.

attention. These accounts present her membership in the International as the sole reason for her presence in Paris. While not neglected in existing scholarship like her fellow foreign Communards Frankel and Dombrowski, the question of Elisabeth Dmitrieff's role in the Paris Commune in terms of her identity as an émigré radical remains open for examination and will be addressed in this study.

Given this limited treatment of foreign Communards, both in the Paris Commune's scholarly canon and the larger literature of Paris's radical émigrés during its Age of Revolutions, this project aims to provide a place and a voice in the existing historiography for these foreign radicals. By presenting these three case studies, this dissertation examines these non-French Communards from a new perspective that accounts for their motivations and aspirations in serving the Commune, rather than just recounting their direct contributions. Moreover, it places them and the other non-French radicals present in 1871 within the larger context of revolutionary émigrés drawn to Paris since 1789, rather than presenting them in relative chronological isolation. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the Paris Commune, as well as Paris's multi-decade role as a lodestone of attraction for Europe's radical community.

Paris, the Commune and European Transnational Radicalism

In his book *Transnational Urbanism*, Michael Peter Smith asserts that "research on transnational processes depicts transnational social relations as 'anchored in' while also transcending one or more nation-states…transnationalist discourse insists on the continuing significance of borders, state policies, and national identities even as these are

often transgressed by transnational communication circuits and social practices."[13] While Smith's purpose with this statement is to distinguish transnationalism from globalization, his description perfectly fits the discourse that characterized the experience of non-French radicals in Paris both during the Commune and stretching back to 1789. From the outset, the French revolutionary tradition (centered and embodied in Paris) presented a discourse that emphasized a universalistic and cosmopolitan set of shared values applicable to all peoples regardless of nationality. This discourse inaugurated the influx of foreign radicals to Paris that began in 1789 and, with ebbs and flows, paralleled every major revolutionary manifestation within the city up to the Commune. However, this repeatedly came into tension with the national parameters and nationalistic impulses of revolution in both Paris and in France as a whole. While this tension eased to a certain degree with the spread of socialist discourse among European radicals (particularly following 1848), it remained a key facet of the environment foreign radicals, particularly those in position of authority such as Frankel, Dmitrieff, and Dombrowski, had to negotiate during the Commune.

Indeed, in some ways the Commune presented a greater challenge than those faced by émigré radicals in 1848, given the intense resurgence of nationalism within Parisian radical discourse in the wake of the Prussian Siege and the French capitulation in January 1871. For these so-called Jacobins or neo-Jacobins, which held the majority of positions within the Communard leadership, the Commune's struggle "was also a patriotic struggle," aimed at restoring France's 1789 status as "the leader of world

[13]Michael Peter Smith, *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2001), 3.

progress with a mission to enlighten less advanced peoples."[14] This of course represents a discourse far removed from the more inclusive, cosmopolitan conception of Paris's revolutionary potential held by both émigré radicals and their more internationalist minded Parisian comrades. Thus, the discussions, debates, and negotiations engaged in by émigré radicals and their colleagues against this ideological view represent an attempt to make the Commune the moment where Paris's revolutionary tradition finally fully transcended its national boundaries and became a universalistic model for liberation. This effort presents a clear example of a transnational discourse, firmly rooted in an understanding of revolution and ideology without any national mooring. For these international radicals, Paris and its revolution belonged to, and therefore could transform, the world.

The transnational approach, or "turn" as some have styled it (others, less enthusiastic, have referred to it as a "pandemic"), has its origins in the late 1980s and early 1990s.[15] Michel Espagne and Michael Warner first posited the idea of "cultural transfer" as a better category of analysis than focusing on individual nation-states in terms of understanding cultural connections between France and Germany.[16] Other scholars, recognizing this approach in their own research, began engaging in an oft-

[14]Shafer, 118.
[15]However, it should be noted that scholars critical of the recent emphasis on the transnational approach argue that its methodology has long been a key element of historical research, prior to its "discovery" over the last few decades. Pierre-Yves Saunier, though a proponent of the transnational approach, argues that an examination of historical scholarship going back to the late nineteenth century reveals the application of the transnational approach even during a period of fairly intense nationalism. He states in this regard that it is "just not possible to claim to have reinvented the wheel." See Pierre-Yves Saunier, "Learning by Doing: Notes about the Making of the Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History," *Journal of Modern European History* 6, no. 2 (2008): 159-180, at 161–62.
[16]Michel Espagne and Michel Werner, *Les Relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIIIe et XIXe siecle)* (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1988).

contentious discussion of the utility of a new "transnational" approach to studying phenomenon that transcend the bounds of nation-states or national-centered analysis. Though some early works, such as those of Espange and Werner, focused on inter-European cultural exchanges,[17] most of the work thus far conducted from the transnational perspective has focused on questions of immigration, migration, colonialism, and post-colonialism.

However, the basic transnational methodology utilized in these fields of study proves highly applicable to examining the intersection in Paris between non-French radicals and the city's revolutionary potential and legacy, primarily during the Commune but earlier as well. Michael Werner's and Bénédicte Zimmermann's concept of "histoire croisée," developed primarily as an alternative to traditional comparative history, contains elements highly useful in understanding the experience of Paris's émigré radicals. They propose a methodology emphasizing "a multidimensional approach that acknowledges plurality and the complex configurations that result from it…accordingly, entities and objects of research are not merely considered in relation to one another but also through one another, in terms of relationships, interactions and circulations."[18] This model of analysis applies quite well to the multilayered networks in Paris during the Commune, where ideology, nationality, international organizations, gender, local groupings, and local concerns all intersected among non-French radicals in their attempts

[17]One other notable example of transnational exchanges in Europe is Johannes Paulmann's work on transfers of "high culture." See Johannes Paulmann, "Internationaler Vergleich und interkultureller Transfer: Zwei Forschungsansätze zur europäischen Geschichte des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts," *Historische Zeitschrift* 267, no. 3 (1998): 649–85.

[18]Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, "Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity," *History and Theory* 45, no. 1 (2006): 30-50, at 38.

to realize a vision capable of going beyond the limits of national discourse. Further, interventions made by these émigré radicals, particularly Leo Frankel through his position on the Communal Council, provide examples of the "histoire croisée" concept of "entangled" histories and illustrate the intermixing and contention between universalistic revolutionary ideas and more French-centric visions of a *République Universelle*.[19] Put more succinctly by Patricia Clavin, this approach establishes transnational connections among Paris's non-French Communards at the level of "the social spaces they inhabit, the networks they form and the ideas they exchange."[20]

In addition to the "histoire croisée" concept, the idea of transnational "shared history" also applies to this study. As discussed by Werner and Zimmerman, this concept originated in ethnic studies but also has been applied in transnational works on gender and in post-colonial studies.[21] This methodology reverberates quite strongly with the perceptions of those émigré radicals drawn to Paris by their belief that the city's revolutionary tradition constituted the common property of all peoples. Though ostensibly French, the cosmopolitan rhetoric employed early in the Great Revolution had resonance and continued to resonant even as nationalism and xenophobia replaced this discourse. It would be this legacy of the revolution, offering the promise of universalistic emancipation, which non-French radicals viewed as a common heritage. This conception of Paris's revolutionary portent provided the impetus for new generations of international

---

[19]Ibid, 31.
[20]Patricia Clavin, "Defining Transnationalism," *Contemporary European History* 14, no. 4 (2005): 421-39, at 422.
[21]Werner and Zimmerman, 32. See also Ann Laura Stoler and Frederic Cooper, "Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda," in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. Ann Laura Stoler and Frederic Cooper, 1-58 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). Stoler's and Cooper's discussion of the transference of the French Revolution's principles and ideology to the then colonial world has interesting parallels with some elements of this project. See 1–3.

radicals to flock to the city when the revolutionary cycle began anew in 1830. Thus, for those who came to Paris just prior to and during the Commune, this revolutionary inheritance constituted a shared history centered on a promised *République Universelle* that offered the potential realization of their individual political and ideological aims.

Beyond shared history, this international perspective on Paris's revolutionary tradition, informed in part by the differing formative national experiences of émigré radicals, corresponds quite closely to Michel Espagne's conception of "hybrid forms" in transnational exchanges. This proposition holds that "foreign" components within a given national culture often play a pivotal but under-recognized role in the formation of key cultural elements. Even if their influence is only minor, their contributions still constitute a factor that must be "included in one's own creation dynamics."[22] Adapted to this study's context by including the political and ideological as well as the cultural, the interventions made by non-French radicals during the Commune, though often contested and at times outright rejected, influenced the general conception of the Commune's revolutionary significance and mission on an international scale. This manifested in several ways, such as in the internationalist language employed by Leo Frankel repeatedly in official statements made in his capacity as Labor and Exchange Commissioner.[23] Given these demonstrated applications, the transnational approach lends itself quite effectively to examining the relationship between émigré radicals in

---

[22]See Michel Espagne, "Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle," *Genèses* 17 (1994): 112–21 and Michel Espagne, "Kulturtransfer und Fachgeschichte der Geisteswissenschaften," *Comparativ* 10 (2000): 41–44. See also Gabriele Lingelbach, "Intercultural Transfer and Comparative History: The Benefits and Limits of Two Approaches," trans. Isabelle Rispler, Karen Beasley, Lana Rings, and Jacqueline Zeledon in *Traversea* 1 (2011): 46–59.

[23]See Chapter 2.

Paris, the Commune, and the larger question of Paris's revolutionary tradition in the context of trans-European (and in some cases, trans-Atlantic) radicalism.

Foreign Radicals in the Commune: A Case Study Approach

Though Paris, as the center of the Enlightenment, served as a site of transnational intellectual discourse for much of the eighteenth century, the events of 1789 transformed the French capital into Europe's new center of radical and revolutionary thought. While earlier generations of foreign *philosophes* traveled to the city to challenge existing metaphysical conceptions of the world, those radicals who journeyed to Paris were inspired by a more materialist vision of revolutionary change. These émigré radical sojourners, inspired by the vision of Paris's revolution portent transforming all existing political and social relations, inaugurated a process of transnational radical discourse within the French capital that reached its apex with the experiences of non-French radicals such as Leo Frankel, Elisabeth Dmitrieff, and Jaroslav Dombrowski during the Paris Commune of 1871. The following chapters will chronicle this process and demonstrate how the Commune thus constituted a pivotal moment in the transnational radical movement.

Before delving into the specific experiences of these foreign Communards, it is first necessary to analyze Paris's post-1789 history as Europe's revolutionary nucleus and establish why 1871 represented such a key moment in the city's history as a site of radical migration. Chapter One, "The Promethean City: Paris's Revolutionary Émigrés (1789–1870)" examines Paris's non-French radical community from the French Revolution to the eve of the Franco-Prussian War. Emphasis is placed on the relationship

between émigré radicals and the city's revolutionary manifestations, particularly those in 1789, 1830, and 1848, in the light of their potential significance for Europe and the broader world. A detailed accounting of these radical immigrants' motivations and aspirations provides perspective on how they attempted, by their support of Parisian radicals and service on the barricades at different revolutionary moments, to evolve the understanding of Paris's revolutionary capacity toward a more universalistic conception. This chapter also highlights moments where the cosmopolitan ideas of these foreign radicals collided with specifically French revolutionary ideas, establishing a pattern of compromise, negotiation, and, at times, confrontation. First manifesting during the French Revolution's radical phase,[24] this tension created a legacy that persisted to the Commune and thus presented its émigré Communards with a serious challenge. Finally, this chapter also analyzes how the development of new ideologies, particularly that of socialism, came to play a role in transforming perceptions of Paris's revolutionary significance within larger frameworks, thus setting the groundwork by the late 1860s for the city's potential "universal moment" during the Commune.

Chapter Two, "Walking the Ideological Tightrope: Leo Frankel, the Commune, and the *République Universelle*," inaugurates the dissertation's case study approach by examining the Hungarian Leo Frankel, the most prominent and highly placed non-French radical within the Commune's leadership. Beginning with his ideologically formative experiences in the German lands, with Marx in London, and in Paris, this chapter establishes his initial fierce commitment to the International, very much a product of his

[24]Sophie Wahnich (*L'impossible Citoyen: L'étranger dans le discours de la Révolution française*) devotes a substantial portion of her analysis to the issue of the tension between the French Revolution's universalism and the nationalist impulse brought on by war and internal dissent by late 1792.

transnational experiences, and his commitment to a universalistic model of revolutionary change. However, his efforts in Paris for the International would bring him into contact with the politically diverse Parisian radical community, many of whom, despite their membership in the International's French branch, held views of revolution and Paris's revolutionary tradition steeped in the French national context and thus highly divergent from Frankel's principles. Informed by his experience, the chapter then examines Frankel's effort following the Revolution of September 4, 1870, and the onset of the Prussian Siege, which demonstrate his growing capacity to balance his own internationalist goals with the growing patriotic sentiments held by many French comrades. With the establishment of the Commune, Frankel's balancing act became more complex, with him using his position at the Commission of Labor and Exchange to push for broad socialist programs while at the same time recognizing the limits placed upon him by the contending social visions held by other Communards. As the Commune adopted a more openly patriotic, neo-Jacobin agenda, Frankel, though holding deep reservations, recognized that the success of Paris's revolution still offered the best chance to realize the *République Universelle* and thus he continued a policy of compromise up until the Commune's last hours. Thus, this chapter illustrates how Leo Frankel, as an émigré radical, negotiated and compromised his ideological principles in the short term in the hopes that a victory for Paris's revolution would eventually facilitate the realization of his own goals.

Shifting genders and nationalities, Chapter Three, "A Russian de Gouges: Elisabeth Dmitrieff and the *Citoyennes* of Paris," focuses on Elisabeth Dmitrieff, the

organizer of the Commune's most active and influential women's organization, the *Union des Femmes*. This chapter analyzes how Dmitrieff came to view Paris's 1871 revolution as the best means for facilitating both the spread of Internationalist socialism and the reordering of women's social and economic relationships on a transnational scale. Like Frankel, Dmitrieff's ideological education spanned nations and discourses, including time in St. Petersburg, in Geneva, and in London with Marx and thus produced a decidedly cosmopolitan view of revolution. Charged by the International's General Council with providing information on the Commune, Dmitrieff arrived in Paris in late March and immediately immersed herself in political activity. Aided by existing personal networks among the city's radicals, she soon developed the idea of establishing a women's organization aimed at representing their interests to the Commune. With Dmitrieff's founding of the *Union des Femmes*, the chapter then focuses on the challenges she faced in attempting to push a universalistic view of reordering social and economic gender relations. Much like Frankel, Dmitrieff discovered the constraints that other ideological models operating within the Commune, particularly those coming from the Proudhon and neo-Jacobin positions, imposed on her particular agenda. Ultimately, the chapter demonstrates how Elisabeth Dmitrieff, recognizing the limits of the political community under the Commune, concluded that making ideological concession and focusing on providing all possible support for the Commune's success presented the best option for seeing a revolutionary model supportive of her vision for gender relations continue.

The Fourth Chapter, "A Son of Poland: Jaroslav Dombrowski, Revolutionary Paris and Polish Liberation," centers on Jaroslav Dombrowski, the most prominent of

several Polish officers who provided the Commune with its most able military leadership. Though trained and commissioned by the Russian Imperial Army, Dombrowski quickly became involved in the cause of Polish independence and actively supported the efforts that culminated in the unsuccessful January Uprising of 1863. Driven into exile in Paris, Dombrowski soon established connections with both fellow Polish exiles and members of the Paris radical community opposed to the Second Empire. This chapter asserts that these connections in Paris transformed Dombrowski's conception of Polish liberation, tying its success to the establishment of a new Poland governed by a democratic and social republic. During the Siege of Paris, Dombrowski's radicalization deepened as a result of his and his fellow Poles dismissive treatment by the Provisional Government. Following the Revolution of March 18, Dombrowski offered his services to the Commune and was given command of Paris's defenses. Despite repeated questions about his loyalty, Dombrowski served the Commune diligently until his death during its last days and saw its victory as the best means of spreading revolution that would fire national liberation in Poland. Thus, this chapter presents Jaroslav Dombrowski as another case of an émigré radical seeking the culmination of his own political goals through the success of revolutionary Paris.

Finally, the Epilogue, "A Parisian Sunset," provides a brief account of Leo Frankel's and Elisabeth Dmitrieff's lives following their escape from Paris. Further, it briefly discusses how the Commune's defeat marked the end of Paris's centrality to European radicalism, as the momentum for both reform and revolutionary socialism moved eastward after 1871. In closing, it briefly analyzes how the Commune's violent

suppression ended the "romantic" vision of international radicalism that drew generations of foreigners to Paris in favor of a professional revolutionary model that would dominate the twentieth century.

In a tribute written for the Commune's fortieth anniversary, Lenin proclaimed that "the Commune fought, not for some local or narrow national aim, but for the emancipation of all toiling humanity, of all downtrodden and oppressed…that is why the cause of the Commune is not dead…it lives to the present day in every one of us."[25] As this study contends, the non-French radicals who participated in the Commune, as well as their forbears, shared this belief that Paris's revolutionary portent, inaugurated by 1789's Great Revolution, constituted a genuine force for universal liberation. In the process, they developed a discourse that envisioned Paris's revolutionary tradition and potential in a truly transnational context. Contested, resisted, and rejected at various moments between 1789 and 1870, the Commune marked the zenith of this discourse among émigré radicals, a moment where all roads of universal revolution originated in Paris.

[25]V.I. Lenin, "In Memory of the Commune," in Karl Marx and V.I. Lenin, *Civil War in France: The Paris Commune*, 104.

Chapter One

The Promethean City: Paris's Revolutionary Émigrés (1789–1870)

On May 28, 1871, the French Army crushed the Paris Commune's final pockets of resistance, the culminating act of a week of slaughter known afterward as "*La Semaine Sanglante"* ("The Bloody Week"). Over the previous seven days, French Communards, along with comrades from Poland, Russia, Hungary, and dozens of other nations perished in the thousands on the barricades or were shot after surrendering to French soldiers. That evening, as the fusillades of firing squads still echoed through the capital, the French Army commander General Patrice de MacMahon proclaimed to the subjugated city "Paris has been delivered…At last the fighting is over; order, work and security will reign once more."[1] Meant only to mark an end to what became branded as Paris's *Année terrible*, these words, though unbeknownst at the time, proved an epitaph for an epoch in the French capital's history. With the Commune's suppression, Paris ceased to operate as Europe's revolutionary epicenter. No longer would its boulevards draw radicals from all corners of Europe driven by the belief that by joining the Parisians on the barricades a revolutionary fire would be sparked that would consume the entire continent. Paris's promise of transformation, first made at the Bastille, perished along with hundreds of Communards on Belleville's barricades.

However, for the eighty-two years between 1789 and 1871, Paris, in addition to driving French politics, served as the cradle of European revolutionary aspirations. Victor Hugo, in his 1874 novel *Quatre-Vingt-Treize*, musing on the origins of the

[1]Reproduced in *Les Murailles Politiques Français* (Paris: Chevalier, 1875), 586.

capital's transnational radical influence, reflected; "And what was the Revolution? It was the victory of France over Europe, and of Paris over France."[2] This chapter, in order to ascertain why Leo Frankel, Elisabeth Dmitrieff, Jaroslav Dombrowski, and other non-French revolutionaries served, fought, and, in some cases, died for the Paris Commune, examines Paris's historical development as Europe's revolutionary capital.

From the French Revolution's earliest phase, Paris drew foreign radicals who "saw in the French Revolution an event for all humanity, from which to draw inspiration…and in which all people, regardless of nationality, were able to participate."[3] Surviving the Revolution's repeated ideological shifts and periodic xenophobic policies, as well as the First Empire, this internationalist tradition reasserted itself in the early nineteenth century, as the July Revolution in 1830 once again established Paris as Europe's preeminent revolutionary center. Drawn by this aura, thousands of young radicals traveled to Paris during the July Monarchy and began operating within the city's political networks. Influenced by changing economic relations and the subsequent spread of socialist discourse, this period saw Paris's revolutionary tradition being articulated by émigré radicals in a much more transnational context. When revolution broke out once again in February 1848, many of Paris's European radicals saw this as another moment to "export revolution" from the city to the rest of the Continent. Though revolutionary aspirations in both Paris and abroad ultimately succumbed to reaction, this conception of the city's transformative power remained and endured into the Second Empire. Bolstered by Europe's growing transnational socialist movements as well as the waning strength of

---

[2]Victor Hugo, *Quatre-Vingt-Treize* (New York: Libraire Français, 1896), 98.
[3]Michael Rapport, *Nationality and Citizenship in Revolutionary France: The Treatment of Foreigners 1789–1799* (New York: Oxford UP, 2000), 80.

Louis Napoleon's regime, the mid to late 1860s saw a new migration of Europe's radicals to Paris. Though possessing different political agendas, these émigrés saw the French capital as a potential revolutionary catalyst capable of best facilitating their specific ideological program. Thus, when the Second Empire fell, non-French activists joined ranks with their Parisian radical counterparts in pressing for a new political and social order that possessed revolutionary possibilities far beyond the city's borders.

Radical Origins: Foreigners, Paris and the Great Revolution

Alexis de Tocqueville, in assessing 1789 with the benefit of sixty-seven years of hindsight, wrote in *The Old Regime and the Revolution* that the French Revolution "by seeming to tend to the regeneration of the human race rather than to the reform of France alone…roused passions such as the most violent political revolutions had been incapable of awakening…it became itself a kind of new religion…which…has covered the world with its fighters, its apostles and its martyrs."[4] However, long before the Revolution's "armed prophets" (traveling in the guise of French soldiers) set out to spread its principles throughout Europe, fervent converts from the Continent and beyond began making pilgrimages to its holy city of revolt: Paris. Though long Europe's intellectual and cultural center, beginning in June 1789 the French capital became the core not just of French revolutionary sentiment but the focal point for European (and American) radicals committed to a broad reinvention of the existing political and social order.

While the Revolution proved transformative in defining Paris's international radical role, the French capital had already possessed some pull on politically active

[4]Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the Revolution,* trans. John Bonner (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1856), 27.

foreigners prior to 1879. Paris's prominence during the Enlightenment provides an excellent example. Projects such as the *Encyclopédie* drew some of Europe's greatest minds to Paris, including several seeking refuge from hostile governments.[5] However, while Enlightenment political thought eventually provided the Revolution with ideological fuel, most of these *philosophes* aimed their efforts at "the improvement of humanity" within "the moral sphere of human endeavor" in a manner "not to be transformed into political action."[6]

Political exiles and fugitives from throughout Europe also resided in Paris by the late eighteenth century. These groups represented a wide variety of nationalities and ideologies. Those that corresponded to the French Crown's foreign policy interests, such as the Catholic Jacobites from the British Isles, enjoyed both welcome and financial support as they arrived in waves between 1688 and 1746. Polish exiles from various royal factions involved in struggles for that nation's crown enjoyed benign toleration during roughly the same period. Even Genevan and Dutch rebels escaping from failed attempts to overthrow their respective governments gained admittance to the capital, though the royal police kept them under careful surveillance.[7] Though these examples demonstrate Paris's importance to foreigners as both intellectual center and refuge, none of the above groups yet viewed the city as a potential crucible to facilitate broad political and social change. Moreover, their presence in Paris depended completely on the monarchy's tolerance and international interests; shared ideological principles with the

---

[5]F. A. Kafker, "Paris, centre principal de l'entreprise Encyclopédie," in *Paris et la Révolution*, ed. Michel Vovelle (Paris: Publications De La Sorbonne, 1989), 202–03.
[6]Rapport, 65.
[7]J.G. Simms, "The Irish on the Continent, 1691–1800," in *A New History of Ireland*, iv. *Eighteenth Century Ireland 1691–1800* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986), 640–44, and Rapport, 65–70.

French people played little or no role. This relationship between Paris and non-French exiles would, like much else in France, undergo a profound redefinition in 1789.

Even prior to the onset of revolution, the crisis of the French monarchy and the debates it inspired drew radicals and intellectuals from across Europe and beyond. Of these, the German noble Anacharsis Cloots presents an excellent example. Born to an aristocratic family of Dutch descent, Cloots became a devotee of the Enlightenment at a young age and established himself in Paris during the 1770s, where he interacted in salons with Rousseau and Benjamin Franklin. However, his ardent promotion of natural religion over Christianity brought him into conflict with French authorities, and in 1785 he left Paris, vowing not to return until the monarchy fell. The debates around the meeting of the Estates General brought him hurrying back to Paris in early 1789 to participate in the growing public fervor.[8] Other non-French intellectuals, such as Karl von Hesse and the Dutch feminist Etta Palm d'Aelders, also arrived in France during the discourse over the Estates General, drawn by the reformist spirit and open exchange it inspired.[9]

The trickle of foreign radicals into Paris prior to June 1789 rapidly became a stream following the National Assembly's emergence from the Estates General and the storming of the Bastille. For many of these émigrés, the Revolution represented a dynamic break in human history, a moment where old national and religious divisions would give way to a universal recognition of natural rights and laws. This vision gained

---

[8] George Peabody Gooch, *Germany and the French Revolution* (New York: Longmans, 1920), 321–24 and Sophie Wahnich, *L'impossible Citoyen: L'étranger dans le discours de la Révolution française* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997), 11–12.
[9] Rapport, 111.

greater validity in late August, when the National Constituent Assembly adopted the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen." During the debates over its passage, Duke Mathieu de Montmorency encapsulated the sentiments that inspired many non-French radicals to travel to the capital, arguing that:

> There are no doubt some truths which are in all hearts, and it is not necessary to prove to a man he is free… (however) many peoples are ignorant of this liberty, being unaware of its extent and its products…let us follow the example of the United States: they have set a great example in the new hemisphere; let us give on our example to the universe, let us offer a model worthy of admiration."[10]

The "Declaration" itself drew heavily on Enlightenment thought by placing sovereignty in the hands of the nation and establishing basic inalienable rights promised through natural law. While the document's intention was to provide the core political and institutional basis for the French state, the universalistic principles it espoused rapidly found resonance with many non-French individuals. As Albert Soboul states, the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen" laid "the foundations of a new social order which seemed applicable not only to France but to the entire human race."[11]

The events of the summer of 1789 electrified many foreigners as they flocked to Paris. Thomas Christie, a Scottish radical who made repeated visits to France between 1789–1791, asserted that "there was no revolution in France in 1789" but rather an event of global proportions, "a closing scene of a revolution that had been the work of an age."[12] Over the months following the Bastille's fall and the "Declaration's" passage a

---

[10]Reproduced in *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Bedford/St. Martins: Boston, 1996), 73–4.
[11]Albert Soboul, *The French Revolution 1787–1799: From the Storming of the Bastille to Napoleon* (Vintage: New York, 1974), 151.
[12]Thomas Christie, *Letters on the Revolution of France* (London, 1791), 63.

wide variety of foreign radicals arrived in Paris, drawn by the Revolution's promise. Some were already experienced revolutionaries, such as Thomas Paine, hero of the American Revolution and famed author of *Common Sense*. For Paine, the French Revolution represented a continuation of the assault the American Revolution had begun on monarchical tyranny, a global crusade in the name of natural law and republican government.[13] Cloots, who deemed the Revolution "the most noble revolution in history," shared Paine's universalistic conception of its significance.[14] Swiss refugees from the failed Fribourg uprising also hurried to Paris to give their support to the revolutionaries.[15] This group established a political club in early 1790 that publically expressed its loyalty to the new French order and their view that all nations should support and follow France's example. For these non-French revolutionaries, 1789 marked the inauguration of a broader revolutionary movement to be assisted and nurtured in France so that it might eventually spread throughout the world.

Other foreigners, establishing the model for subsequent generations who came to Paris, "viewed the Revolution in the light of their own aspirations."[16] A young Nikolai Karamzin, present in Paris during the second half of 1789, initially viewed the Revolution as offering a possible model of constitutional monarchy Russia could emulate.[17] Several émigrés from the German lands, such as Georg Kerner, shared similar

---

[13]Jack Fruchtman, *Thomas Paine: Apostle of Freedom* (Four Walls Eight Windows: London, 1994), 8–9. See also John Keane, *Thomas Paine: A Political Life* (Grove: New York, 2003), 284–85.
[14]Gooch, 325.
[15]The 1781 Fribourg uprising was an unsuccessful attempt by Swiss democrats to overthrow the governing patriarchs of Fribourg. See Mathiez, 10.
[16]Rapport, 114.
[17]Karamzin would rapidly become disillusioned with the Revolution, particularly as attacks on Louis XVI became more vicious. His later veneration of autocracy in his literary and historical works can be credited in part to this experience during his youth. See *Essays on Karamzin: Russian Man-of-Letters, Political*

sentiments, hoping that the Revolution's initial support of liberal monarchy could force similar changes across the Rhine.[18] More radical in sentiment, the professional soldier and physician François Amédée Doppet came from Savoy, hoping that the Revolution would provide a vehicle for spreading purely republican forms of government beyond France's borders. For many foreigners flocking to Paris, the Revolution presented a model that could be actualized within France and then exported to their countries of origin.

While some foreigners viewed the Revolution purely as a means of realizing political change only, others came to Paris due to its potential to challenge both existing political and social conventions. The British novelist and poet Helen Maria Williams represents one of several foreign feminists drawn to the Revolution's capital due to the possibilities it presented for attacking the existing order that denied women equal agency. First arriving in early 1790, Williams frequented salons discussing women's issues, as well as attending the Fête de la Fédération held on the anniversary of the Bastille's fall. Describing the experience, she related "this was not a time in which the distinctions of country were remembered…it was a triumph of human kind…and it required but the common feeling of humanity to become in that moment a citizen of the world."[19]

Similarly attracted by the Revolution's promise of universal emancipation was William's fellow Briton and feminist activist Mary Wollstonecraft. Though not arriving

---

Thinker, Historian, 1766–1826, ed. Joseph Laurence Black and Nikolaĭ Mikhaĭlovich Karamzin (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 91–98.

[18]Kerner became greatly disillusioned in 1792 when sentiment turned against Louis XVI and fought that August to protect the Tuileries from the revolutionaries, barely managing to escape with his life. However, even after these events, he still refused to denounce the Revolution itself, arguing instead that its principles had been hijacked. See Gooch, 340–42.

[19]Helen Maria Williams, *Letters Written in France in the Summer of 1790,* 4th Edition (London, 1794), 13–14. Also cited in Rapport, 83.

in France until late 1792, Wollstonecraft became deeply engaged in advocating for the Revolution with her 1790 publication of *A Vindication of the Rights of Man*. Publically responding to Edmund Burke's critique of the Revolution and its defenders, Wollstonecraft asserted that the Revolution's promotion of republican principles represented a huge step forward for mankind and represented the realization of the Enlightenment vision of just government.[20] Influenced further by the Revolution's debates regarding women's education and natural rights, she followed with her 1792 essay *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* that tied revolutionary republicanism to an expansion of rights for women. Viewing the declaration of a French republic in September 1792 as a moment when theory might be brought into practice, Wollstonecraft traveled to Paris two months later. Upon her arrival, she established contact with Williams and became a frequenter of her salons along with Thomas Paine, the Latin American revolutionary Francisco de Miranda, and other non-French radicals, as well as prominent members of the Girondist faction.[21] For early European feminists, Paris and the Revolution presented a universalistic language that called for the political and social equality of all people without any reference to gender. These early efforts established a model that subsequent generations of émigré feminists would emulate.

This migration of foreign radicals initially enjoyed widespread support from the revolutionary community within Paris. Some hoped to draw upon the experience and expertise of these foreign radicals, hoping to benefit from the "moral and intellectual

---

[20]Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (London, 1790), 20–32, 98–105.
[21]See "Letter, Mary Wollstonecraft to Everina Wollstonecraft, December 24, 1792," in *The Collected Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd (New York: Columbia UP, 2003), 214–15 and Ralph Martin Wardle, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Critical Biography* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska UP, 1966), 179–84.

cross-pollination which would result."[22] Both Mirabeau and Lafayette established groups of foreign intellectuals, particularly those with experience in the American Revolution, to help formulate laws and policies for France's new Constituent Assembly.[23] Other French revolutionaries took a more paternalistic and slightly condescending attitude, viewing their role "as the instructor of nations, as the protectors of the oppressed," thus seeing "in every foreigner…a brother, a slightly inferior brother to whom they would be the charitable and generous tutors…all those who suffered for the cause of liberty became their dearest friends."[24] While this latter category of French radicals embraced the same universalistic elements that drew foreign adherents, they emphasized to émigrés that only by working for the Revolution's success in France would they be able to see its virtues spread to their respective homelands.

This emphasis illustrates the great paradox of the Revolution in terms of its relationship with foreign radicals. Without question most French revolutionaries believed, at least initially, their cause to be that of all mankind, hence their welcoming to Paris like-mind individuals from throughout Europe and the Americas. As Rodgers Brubaker notes, the early Revolution took France's pre-1789 cosmopolitanism, "recast it in ideological terms… (and) invested it with a missionary fervor." At the same time, the Revolution, beginning with the Declaration of the Rights of Man, vested sovereignty in the collective hands of the nation, thus giving birth to modern nationalism and national identity. This concept of the nation, according to Brubaker, "constructed new boundaries

---

[22]Rapport, 113
[23]Ibid.
[24]Albert Mathiez, *La Révolution et les Etrangers: cosmopolitisme et défense nationale* (Paris: La Renaissance du livre, 1918), 29.

and sharpened antagonisms between nations." Thus while on one hand claiming to act in the interests of all mankind, the French revolutionaries' political principles called upon them to act first in the interest of France's body politic, composed exclusively of the French people. Reconciling this definition of the nation (which lacked clear articulation at this historical moment) with the universalism of the Revolution's principles created at times tension that could not easily be reconciled, thus complicating the status of Paris's foreign radical community as the political situation became more unstable.[25]

The outbreak of war with Austria and Prussia in April 1792 began a reconfiguration of the relationship between the French revolutionaries and the Revolution's non-French adherents. As would later be the case in September 1870, foreign foes placed Paris, and subsequently, the Revolution, in danger. However, in 1792 the ideological connections between French and international radicals lacked the sophistication and shared history that would temper French chauvinism during the Prussian Siege and Commune eight decades later. The place of non-French radicals did not change immediately. Indeed, the early months of the war saw some of these foreign revolutionaries rise in prominence, particularly those who offered their service or attacked France's enemies in writing. The Girondists drew many of these individuals to their ranks, including several from Prussia and the Habsburg lands, and encouraged them to spread pro-Revolution propaganda and even serve in the revolutionary army. Albert Mathiez, commenting on this policy, asserts that "foreigners were never more pampered, more exalted than in that moment of history…when (they) were engaged in a fight to the

[25]Rodgers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992), 35–44 and Wahnich, 9.

death with their countries of origin."[26] While these actions kept many non-French radicals in the revolutionaries' good graces, they illustrate a movement away from cosmopolitanism toward an emphasis on France's national interests.

Further evidence of the increasing tension between the Revolution's growing nationalism and the role of Paris's non-French radicals came in late August and early September of 1792 when, just as France transitioned to a republic, a large group of these foreigners were granted naturalized French citizenship. According to the decree issued on August 26, 1792, "these men, who by their writing and by their courage, have served the cause of liberty and prepared the liberation of peoples, cannot be regarded as foreigners."[27] In some cases, such as with George Washington and James Madison, this constituted a wholly symbolic act. However, with those who prominently participated in the Revolution within France, such as Paine, Cloots, Joseph Priestly, and John Oswald, this represented an attempt to preserve the Revolution's internationalist character even as patriotic sentiment grew. When Paine won election to the Convention soon after, his supporters even began addressing him with the French surname of Penne.[28] This growing political transformation, coupled with a deteriorating military situation, served to place Paris's non-French radical community in a complicated and potentially precarious position.

---

[26]Mathiez, 71 and Rapport, 5.
[27]Quoted in Brubaker, 46.
[28]Mathiez, 77 and Rapport, 138. On Cloots see Gooch, 325, on Paine see John Goldworth Alger, *Englishmen in the French Revolution* (London: St. Dunstan's House, 1889), 84. While none of the individuals given citizenship publically rejected it, several, such as Washington, never made any acknowledgement of the honor.

For foreign radicals, the moment of true crisis arrived in early 1793, as a combination of military defeats and domestic discord pressed the Revolution in a more militant, nationalistic, and xenophobic direction. The Jacobin-dominated Convention, driven in part by the demands of the Parisian masses' for more stringent security measures, began viewing foreigners, including those who had loyally served the Revolution, as enemy nationals and potential foreign agents. While accusations of this sort targeting non-French radicals occurred later during the Prussian Siege in 1870 and the Commune in 1871, the measures taken in 1793 constituted a rather draconian policy shift by the revolutionary government aimed against foreigners, including many ardent supporters. During the early months of 1793, non-French radicals in Paris and beyond were subjected to government surveillance, ordered to carry special passports, and placed under a separate and harsher criminal code than French citizens. Initially, those capable of proving their devotion to the Revolution were exempted.[29] Moreover, the Constitution of 1793, ratified in late June, contained language that appeared to confirm the Revolution's cosmopolitan spirit regarding foreign radicals who adhered to its principles. Beyond establishing a low threshold for becoming a naturalized citizen through work or marriage, this Constitution also contained a provision declaring that "every alien whom the legislative body has declared as one well deserving of the human race, are admitted to exercise the rights of a French citizen."[30]

Despite this inclusive language, within weeks of the Constitution's passage the situation of non-French radicals in Paris significantly worsened as the Convention's

[29]Brubaker, 46–47.
[30] "The French Republic Constitution of 1793" in *On Civil Liberty and Self-Government*, 3rd revised edition, ed. Theodore D. Woolsey, (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1883).

Jacobins moved to purge the Girondist faction. Since the Girondists' emergence in late 1791, many prominent émigrés allied themselves with this faction, drawn by both its universalistic revolutionary rhetoric and its relative moderation on questions of political restructuring. Both Thomas Paine and Anacharsis Cloots actively collaborated with its members in the Convention on a variety of issues, while others, such as Helen Maria Williams and Mary Wollstonecraft, established informal connections with the faction through Paris's salon network. Driven by the Jacobins from the Convention in early June, the leading Girondists found themselves arrested and charged with treason in late July, with the majority of them going to the guillotine in late October 1793.[31] The violent political discord within Paris, coupled with reverses on the battlefield and rural reactionary revolts, placed the Parisian pro-revolutionary émigré community in a highly precarious position. In this fluid environment, "the fate of foreigners…was increasingly linked to their political reliability… (and) many foreigners had already become associated with politicians whose ideas and behavior were to be discredited by crisis and betrayal."[32]

This moment of political and military crisis produced a patriotic impulse that rapidly transformed into outright xenophobia and ended Paris's initial manifestation as an intentional revolutionary center. The harsh policies toward foreigners introduced in early 1793 were supplemented by outright draconian measures, such as the August 1 decree calling for the arrest of all subjects of nations at war with France who had arrived since 1789. Foreign volunteer units serving within the French military, once gladly welcomed,

[31]Soboul, 309–11.
[32]Rapport, 187–88.

were disbanded and saw many from their ranks arrested.[33] Though at first exempted due to their prominence, leading figures within Paris's foreign radical community soon fell victim to the xenophobic fervor. Several English radicals, including Helen Maria Williams, were arrested in October and imprisoned in the Palais Luxembourg. Mary Wollstonecraft, understanding the consequences of her Girondist connections, fled Paris to avoid arrest and settled in the countryside with her American lover, who protected her from arrest by claiming her as his wife and thus an American citizen.[34]

Even those holding positions within the French government did not escape the purge of non-French nationals. In mid-December, the Convention expelled all foreigners from its ranks and from any position within the government. Soon after, the Committee of Public Safety ordered Thomas Paine's arrest and imprisonment, beginning a ten month ordeal that brought him close to the guillotine several times and only ended when American intervention secured his release.[35] Anacharsis Cloots, arrested at the same time as Paine, proved far less fortunate. Confined to a dank cell at the Luxembourg, the "orator of the human race" found himself implicated in the false "foreign plot" that brought down the Hébertists and was guillotined in March 1794. Though a handful of foreign radicals maintained their positions (mostly within the French Army), by early 1794 the fate of Cloots and others drove most non-French revolutionaries out of Paris,

---

[33]Mathiez, 144–46.
[34]Alger,70–73 and Rapport, 225.
[35]Keane, 401–04. Gouverneur Morris, the American Ambassador at the time of Paine's arrest, did little to secure his release, resenting Paine's radicalism during the American Revolution and viewing him as thus paying the price for his political extremism. Paine, aware of Morris's position, later condemned him for the damage imprisonment had done to his health. Paine's deliverance ultimately came with the intervention of a new American Ambassador, the much more sympathetic Virginian James Monroe, who secured Paine's release in November 1794.

aware that xenophobic patriotism and political violence had, for the moment, extinguished the city's transformative and universalist promise.

While many non-French radicals hoped for a return to the Revolution's more cosmopolitan spirit following Thermidor, a general distrust of foreigners remained prevalent in Paris and beyond even after the Committee of Public Safety's removal. Imprisoned foreign radicals, such as Paine, found themselves excluded from the mass release of political prisoners following Robespierre's overthrow. Indeed, the French government did not free the final wave of émigrés taken by the Jacobins during the Terror until July 1795.[36] This reality stemmed primarily from the continued pressures of war, which manifested themselves within Paris in the form of spiraling prices and periodic food shortages. In this environment, foreigners, regardless of their sympathies, could only move freely in the capital with a visa issued by each district's government. The Constitution of 1795 (Year III) further reinforced this move away from cosmopolitanism. Dispensing with the universalistic language that characterized the Revolution's early halcyon days, this document eliminated the idea of "honorary and political naturalization as a special reward or compensation for service to the nation" and thus subjected all foreigners, regardless of ideological persuasion, to the same level of scrutiny.[37] While Paris endured as a revolutionary symbol, it became, in terms of day to day reality under the Directory, a site cool and, at times, hostile toward non-French radicals and foreigners in general. The final closing of Paris's first manifestation as a revolutionary center came with Napoleon Bonaparte's seizure of power. His Civil Code

---

[36]Alger, 334–40.
[37]Peter Sahlins, *Unnaturally French: Foreign Citizens in the Old Regime and After* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2004), 289.

introduced a model for the treatment of foreigners very close to that which had existed prior to 1789, where economic benefit, rather than ideology, dictated who would find welcome in Paris or anywhere else in France.[38]

While events conspired to end Paris's initial moment as an international revolutionary center, the legacy of that period firmly established the French capital as the epicenter of radicalism for Europe and beyond. As Eric Hobsbawm states in his classic *Age of Revolution*, Paris, as the "Cockpit of the Revolution," not only "provided the vocabulary and issues of liberal and radical democratic politics for most of the world," but also established "the pattern for all subsequent revolutionary movements, its lessons being incorporated into modern socialism and communism."[39] This universalistic transformative promise could not fail to draw international radicals of all stripes, who viewed Paris as a site to negotiate and realize their own ideological projects.

However, tension between the Revolution's principles and the European political environment in which it operated served to constrain Paris's capacity to function as a genuine transnational radical center. As discussed above, war and internal division had, by 1792, pushed the Revolution in the direction of xenophobic policies driven by excessive patriotism and the perceived need for internal security. One outcome of this was the eventual targeting of non-French radicals like Paine. More fundamentally, this sweeping nascent nationalism produced a new political order by 1793, one no longer capable of promoting the inclusive model of revolutionary change foreign radicals envisioned in 1789. While many of the initial expressions of universalism were genuine,

---

[38]Brubaker, x and Rapport, 319.
[39]Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848* (New York: Vintage, 1996), 53–55.

for the Jacobins and their allies, "French revolutionary universalism had been mainly a matter of rhetoric…nationalism had become dominant in the Revolution itself."[40] This ultimately meant that, rather than providing an origin point for radical, participatory liberation, Paris instead turned to France's revolutionary armies to spread the ideals of Liberté, Egalité, and Fraternité under the aegis of the bayonet. What would be required were new forms of identity arising from economic change, intellectual development, as well as the Revolution itself, for Paris to be perceived as not just the site of revolutionary conception but also the incubator of transnational radical change.

The Revolution Renewed: Paris from 1830 to 1848

Revolutionary nationalism had, by the end of the 1790s, greatly limited Paris's revolutionary magnetism. The Bourbon Restoration, coming amid a continental tide of reaction, further reduced the city's pull on non-French radicals but did not extinguish it entirely. Even during this reactionary period, foreign radicals from failed revolutions in Portugal, Naples, and Piedmont sought haven in Paris and used the French capital as a base for furthering their respective clandestine agendas.[41] Moreover, this relative political quietude proved as short-lived as the return of the *fleur-de-lis*. Institutional discord, economic depression, and ill-advised repression fired a new surge of rebellious spirit within Paris, culminating in an outbreak of revolt and brief street-fighting in July 1830. While debate continues over whether "The Three Glorious Days" constituted a

[40]Conor Cruise O'Brien, "Nationalism and the French Revolution" in *The Permanent Revolution: The French Revolution and its Legacy, 1789–1989*, ed. Geoffrey Best, 17-48 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), at 27.
[41]Diaz Delphine, "Les réfugiés politiques étrangers dans la France des années 1830: De la redéfinition des figures d'autorité à la contestation des normes," *Hypothèses* 1 (2011): 267-278, at 267.

simple regime change or a genuine revolution, 1830 unquestionably inaugurated the resurgence of Paris's role as Europe's radical center.

Already during the July Days, Paris's émigré population played a small but notable role. According to several accounts, a mixed party of Piedmontese, Italians, Neapolitans, Spaniards, and Poles actively participated in the fighting. Their main body, under the command of General Guillaume de Vaudancourt, clashed with royalist forces near la Place de Grève. "Exiled for their political opinions," these foreign radicals, according to a sympathetic French observer, viewed revolution in France as spurring change in their respective states and were thus willing to make themselves "martyrs in the cause of liberty."[42] In his memoirs, the Marquis de Lafayette recognized these contributions and asserted that the new Orleanist regime had, as a result, "sacred duties to fulfil toward foreigners of several nations" that had fought alongside the Parisian insurgents in 1830. These duties not only included providing financial support and guaranteeing "certain natural rights of which foreigners should not be deprived," but also encouraging them in their efforts to promote political change in their respective countries on a model similar to that being realized in post-1830 France. For Lafayette, 1830 and what he referred to as the "Principles of July" meant a reassertion of the universalistic ideals for which he had fought during both the American and French Revolutions.[43] Though the Orleanist Government moved rapidly to extinguish such revolutionary

---

[42]See Charles Caleb Colton, *Narrative of the French Revolution in 1830: An Authentic Detail of the Events which Took Place on the 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th of July* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1830), 322 and David Turnbull, *The French Revolution of 1830: The Events which Produced It, and the Scenes by which it was Accompanied* (London: Boston and Palmers, 1830), 128–29.

[43]Bernard Alexis Sarrans, *Memoirs of General Lafayette and of the French revolution of 1830, Volume 2* (London: Bentley, 1832), 347–52.

sentiments, Lafayette's interpretation of 1830, whether correct or not, mirrored that of a new wave of non-French radicals that gravitated into the French capital during the early 1830s.

As was the case in 1789, this new wave of political immigrants initially shared little in terms of ideological unity aside from holding adversarial positions toward both their respective national and the general European status quo. The already-mentioned Spanish and Italian émigrés shared the same general liberalism and commitment to constitutional rule exhibited by the French Orleanists. From the German lands, republican-minded nationalists flocked to the French capital, hoping to rekindle the same fire that had spread eastward following the Great Revolution. Members of the Young Germans movement hoped to export a republican nationalism that would both liberalize and unify the German lands. Exemplifying these sentiments, Heinrich Heine traveled to Paris in early 1831, asserting "Liberty is the new religion, the religion of our day .... The French are the chosen people of that religion…Paris is the new Jerusalem, and the Rhine is the Jordan which separates the holy land of liberty from the country of the Philistines."[44] Other German activists followed, particularly as government repression of their activities intensified in 1832. Many of these Germans became deeply immersed in Parisian radicalism in the hopes of eventually exporting a revolutionary model more in line with their politics.

---

[44]Antonina Vallentin, *Heine: Poet in Exile*, trans. Harrison Brown (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1956), 157. For a more detailed account of the Revolution of 1830's impact on the German lands, see Jonathan Sperber, "Echoes of the French Revolution in the Rhineland, 1830–1849," *Central European History* 22 (1989): 200–17.

Though Germans constituted a substantial number of the post-1830 influx, Paris's largest expatriate community had its origins beyond both the Rhine and the Oder. Despite the partition and disappearance of the Polish state in 1795, the idea of a Polish nation endured in the aspirations of its population, which waited for a political opportunity to throw off their foreign, particularly Russian, yoke. In November 1830, the model of the July Revolution and the rumor that Russia planned to use Polish soldiers to intervene in France prompted an uprising in Warsaw that quickly spread throughout Poland. Despite some early Polish successes, Russia's overwhelming manpower left the ultimate outcome in little doubt. In the early fall of 1831 the Russian Army crushed the last vestiges of Polish resistance. However, nearly 7500 Poles refused to accept defeat and renewed Russian subjugation and fled abroad. Given the role the Parisian example played in prompting the uprising, over 6000 of these Polish exiles settled within the French capital and rapidly established an active émigré community dedicated to promoting Poland's eventual liberation.[45] Despite sharing this overarching purpose, Paris's Polish community stood divided from the onset over the political form they envisioned for a free Polish state. A small minority, primarily drawn from the old aristocracy, rallied behind Prince Adam Czartoryski, whom they viewed as Poland's virtual king-in-exile. The vast majority opposed establishing a monarchy and, drawing on the influence of both 1789 and 1830, advocated for a Poland governed on more liberal and republican principles. In March 1832, these Polish émigrés founded the Polish Democratic Society in Paris. Like the Young Germans, these Poles rapidly established

[45]Eugene J. Kisluk, *Brothers from the North: The Polish Democratic Society and the European Revolutions of 1848–49* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005), 1.

contacts among Parisian radicals and thus found themselves heavily involved in the city's political upheavals stemming from dissatisfaction with the post-1830 political order.[46]

The post-1830 émigré wave, fired by the images of the "Three Glorious Days" on the barricades, found a very different mood than they anticipated upon their respective arrivals in Paris. The workers, young intellectuals, and republicans who viewed the July Revolution as marking a rekindling of the "spirit of 1789" quickly became disillusioned with the Louis-Phillip regime. According to Mark Traugott, by 1831 this cooling developed into "simmering political discontent, especially among young republicans, who felt that they had spilled their blood on the 1830 barricades only to have their revolution stolen by a coterie of opportunists" uninterested in any real reforms in terms of furthering popular participation in politics.[47] While Parisian workers also resented the lack of political change, their discontent primarily stemmed from the failure of the July Monarchy to institute measures aimed at substantially improving their material conditions. Specifically, they expected their service on the barricades to translate into policies aimed at helping "the poor in more structured ways, such as a defense of workers associations" and aid in dealing with their employers. What they witnessed was the Orleanist regime openly siding with employers and wealthy interests and using troops to break up protests and strikes.[48] Given these realities, there developed an overwhelming sense among Parisian radicals that the revolution had not yet managed to achieve the necessary changes they believed they were fighting for on the barricades. For many of

---

[46]Ibid, 2–4 and Mark Traugott, *The Insurgent Barricade* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2010), 160–61.
[47]Traugott, 2.
[48]Pamela Pilbeam, *The 1830 Revolution in France* (New York: St. Martin's, 1991), 176–77.

the foreign radicals coming to Paris in the hopes of exporting a model for revolutionary change, this required a choice: remain aloof and focus on their own particular aspirations or commit to supporting their Parisian comrades and hope that their victory would mark an international tide of change.

On the surface these circumstances appear similar to those that first drew émigrés to Paris in 1789, an effort that ultimately failed as revolutionary cosmopolitanism gave way to the fervent patriotism and anti-foreign sentiment of 1792. However, political conditions in the early 1830s differed in several important respects. First, unlike in 1792, the Parisians with whom foreign radicals hoped to make common cause operated not just outside of government but also in direct opposition to the existing regime within France. Thus, the focus centered not on a perceived non-French threat but rather the political order within, meaning émigrés bore no stigma in the eyes of Paris's radical opposition. Though the secret societies that developed immediately after 1830 were, in the words of Pamela Pilbeam, "self-consciously" Robespierrist and Jacobin, this only referred to their republican principles and not to their view of foreigners. Indeed, one of the most prominent of these Parisian groups, the Society of the Rights of Man, developed connections with the Polish Democratic Society and other similar foreign political organizations within the city.[49] Taken by itself, this inclusive spirit among Parisian radicals can be viewed simply as a political opposition that attempted to rally anyone willing to aid in realizing political change. However, the more internationalist spirit uniting Parisian and foreign radicals in the early 1830s drew on a larger transnational

[49]Pamela Pilbeam, *French Socialists Before Marx: Workers, Women and the Social Question in France* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2000), 30–31 and Kisluk, 5.

political and social discourse that to some extent drew upon Revolutionary legacies which eventually would redefine Paris's broader revolutionary importance.

This discourse centered on a language of opposition beginning to develop among radicals throughout Europe, one that showed signs of evolving into a transnational sense of identity. In twentieth-century Communist historiography (though not in the works of Marx himself), this development was easily identified, with 1830 viewed as marking the first manifestations of the proletariat as a political force, though one still operating in conjunction with the lower echelons of the bourgeoisie. This of course came about as industrialization transformed material conditions and developed working class consciousness. However, the economic realities within both France and continental Europe at that time provide no support for this thesis, given the very limited degree of industrialization and the continued predominance of shop-level production.[50]

This does not mean that economics played no role in the growth of a transnational radical consciousness. While full-scale industrialization and true proletarianization did not become a general trend on the Continent until the latter half of the nineteenth century, artisans and small-scale workers still experienced changes that threatened both their positions and wages. Growing consumer demand, as well as competition from England, led many European producers to turn away from making items to order and instead concentrate on "lower quality, standardized, ready-to-wear or ready-to-use items that could be produced more efficiently and sold at a lower price."[51] Given that much of this work could be done by workers with limited training, this new approach to production

[50]See Pilbeam, *1830*, 121–50, which deals with this question of the Marxist interpretation in great detail. See also Francois Furet, *Revolutionary France: 1770–1880* (London: Blackwell, 1995).
[51]Sewell, 157.

threatened the status and wages of artisans. Moreover, legal changes by the early nineteenth century, with their greater emphasis on individual property rights, removed nearly all of the protections artisans and their crafts had enjoyed under the Old Regime. William Sewell, summing up the situation for these artisans and small scale producers during the early nineteenth century, concludes that while artisans "were still proud, numerous, and essential to the function of the economy…they were also financially squeezed, threatened with a loss of skill and status, and provided with virtually no legal form of collective defense against…the free market."[52]

While these economic concerns account in part for the radicalism of artisans and other small-scale laborers, they still do not explain how Parisian workers and other non-laboring radicals came to embrace a common cause. Beyond the shared economic uncertainties, the post-1830 order also produced a shared experience of political exclusion which served to produce a common language for early-nineteenth-century European radicals. For Parisian radicals, this discourse developed out of the resentment stemming from the July Revolution's unfulfilled promise. Tony Judt, addressing the origins of this identity, characterizes the process as follows:

> Given that nothing had altered overnight in the varied nature of French industrial life, it follows that it was specifically political experience (and lessons) of 1830 which lay behind the rapid growth in collective identification. It is a cliché to note that the events of July 1830 aroused great optimism and hope which were almost immediately dampened down…Yet as such clichés go, it is remarkably to the point…everywhere…there was a reference to the disappointments of those years and the realization that the working population must now act alone, and on its own behalf.[53]

---

[52]Ibid, 161.
[53]Tony Judt, *Marxism and the French Left: Studies in Labor and Politics in France, 1830–1981* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 60.

This concept of identity formation through shared political exclusion appeared in all strata of Parisian radicals. Sewell, in his study of the language of labor, states that workers in the aftermath of 1830 came to view political rights as fundamental to their efforts to associate and organize their own labor. He further contends that demands for these rights to form their own associations "became compatible with a certain interpretation of liberty" drawn from the principles articulated during the French Revolution.[54] Thus, though these workers sought the redress of economic and social ills, they viewed political change, given their exclusion by the Orleanist regime, as an essential mechanism to realizing their goals. This emphasis united them with the radical Republican movement (whose primary focus had also been the political) by early 1832. As Sewell states, this political oppositionist identity created "a confluence of interests, ideas and activities that joined the most radical of the Parisian republicans to the most militant of the Parisian workingmen" in a unified front against the July Monarchy and the elite political and economic order it was viewed as representing.[55]

This oppositional basis of belief readily appealed to the non-French radicals, who, though drawn to Paris by its perceived post-1830 revolutionary potential, came with their own specific sets of aspirations. However, unlike the situation in 1789, they found themselves operating within a Parisian radical community attempting to seize the reins of power rather than actively being involved in the process of transforming discourse into governance and policy. This unburdened émigrés from reformulating their own ideological projects to correspond precisely with the goals of French radicals (who were

[54]William H. Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980), 205–06.
[55]Sewell, 208–09.

themselves by no means united). Coupled with the removal of 1792's intensifying chauvinism, this produced a unity of purpose among Parisian and foreign radicals not previously seen. Moreover, while divided on the specifics, the post-1830 émigré wave, as demonstrated by organizations such as the Polish Democratic Society and several German republican organizations, shared the Parisian radicals' adherence to republicanism and their related demands for greater economic opportunity for all strata of society.[56] While Paris's revolutionary legacy still exercised a substantial pull on non-French radicals, the tensions that had existed between French and non-French radicals during the Great Revolution no longer existed, and thus allowed them to form much more substantial bonds with their French counterparts within the city.

This new sense of post-1830 ideological solidarity and common cause between Paris's French and non-French radicals was not simply a matter of joint discussions and declarations in cafés and backroom meetings. A toxic political environment existed in the French capital by early 1832, driven by a growing and deepening discontent aimed at the perceived unfulfilled promises of the Orleanist regime. This popular discontent boiled over on June 5, 1832, as the funeral of the popular Bonapartist-turned-republican General Maximilien Lamarque transformed into a full-scale but short-lived uprising against Louis Phillip's government. Even before the first barricades were erected, non-French radicals constituted a visible and active component within the revolt. Heinrich Heine, a sympathetic but passive observer, recounts that both Polish and Italian expatriates spoke at the General's funeral alongside such popular figures as Lafayette just

[56]Rudolph Stadelmann, *Social, and Political History of the German 1848 Revolution* (Athens: Ohio UP, 1975), 88–91 and Traugott, 163.

prior to the outbreak of violence.[57] Heine later identified German radicals among those defending a barricade in the area of Saint-Martin, serving beside their French counterparts in clashes with loyal National Guardsmen and garrison soldiers.[58] Though the last barricades fell to the French Army the next day, this brief uprising served to demonstrate both the depth of interaction between Paris's French and non-French radicals, as well as the latter's level of commitment to supporting revolution in Paris as a key step in realizing their own aspirations. When two years later the barricades went up again (albeit on a much smaller scale) the pattern of foreign expatriate involvement repeated itself, demonstrating that the ties established in 1831–1832 continued to hold among Parisian radicals of various nationalities.[59] Clearly, a tie of both ideology and shared revolutionary experience had been established between nationals and non-nationals within the capital's radical circles.

Given the failure of the 1832 and 1834 uprisings, both French and non-French radicals in Paris turned away (at least for the moment) from emphasizing revolt as a means of realizing revolutionary change. However, this by no means limited Paris's pull on revolutionary-minded individuals throughout the Continent and beyond. The influx of politically-minded expatriates and exiles actually accelerated by the early 1840s, reaching such a degree that scholars have described Paris during the pre-1848 period as "the

---

[57]Heinrich Heine, *De la France* (Paris: Calmann Levy, 1884), 214.
[58]Ibid, 216, see also Traugott, 4–5.
[59]The April 1834 uprising was an organized insurrection (prompted in part by a much larger uprising in Lyon) by the Society of the Rights of Man aimed at the installation of a republic. However, given the secretive nature of its organization, the revolt failed to mobilize significant portions of the Parisian population. While several Germans and Poles participated alongside French workers and students, the Orleanist regime managed to put down the uprising with relative ease within less than 24 hours. See Jill Harsin, *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830–1848* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 84–101 and Jonathan Mallory House, *Controlling Paris: Armed Forces and Counter-revolution, 1789–1848* (New York: New York UP, 2014), 46–49.

revolutionary capital of Europe" and the "Mecca of the Malcontents."[60] While the revolutionary tradition and Paris's primacy in 1789 can account for this in part, other factors, reflecting broader movements in radical ideological development, were also in play in France's capital by the mid-1830s.

During the upheavals of the early 1830s, it became apparent that a shared political culture and set of political aspirations unified Parisian radicals from both French and foreign backgrounds. Unquestionably, these common principles found expression, as Judt notes, within the tenets of the revolutionary "catechism" inherited from 1789 and 1792, providing a rough model demanding "that power…be transferred at a single moment in time, and by a highly ritualized process of collective action." This model further asserted that the institution of an impersonal dictatorship, guided by the popular will, constituted an essential element of any radical seizure of power by the people.[61] However, this blueprint failed miserably in 1832 and 1834, leading Parisian radicals to examine critically their approach to imagining and realizing revolutionary change.

Though the model of 1789 remained highly influential among both French and non-French radicals, intense debates began raging over the applicability of the revolutionary model to conditions in the nineteenth century. It was this discourse, centered primarily in Paris, that first brought the term socialism into currency, first defined by the Saint-Simonian Pierre Leroux in his 1834 pamphlet "Individualism and Socialism" as "the Doctrine which will sacrifice none of the terms of the formula:

---

[60]Georges Bourgin, "1848 en Europe," in *1848: Le livre du centenaire,* ed. Charles Moulin, 81-108 (Paris: Atlas, 1948), at 87 and E.H. Carr, *Michael Bakunin* (New York: Octagon, 1975), 125. Cited in Traugott, 160.

[61]Judt, 107–10.

Liberty, Fraternity, Equality, Unity, but which reconciles them all."[62] Though other prominent early socialist thinkers, including Charles Fourier, Louis Blanc, and Etienne Cabet, agreed with such a concept in principle, they expressed strong reservations about accepting the revolutionary tradition as inalterable scripture for societal transformation, given its emphasis on conflict and the use of violence to realize social change. These thinkers "claimed to be in pursuit of harmony, association and mutualism, all to be gained through cooperation, not conflict."[63] Though not explicitly socialist, many republicans, though drawing inspiration from the Great Revolution, also questioned the use of revolutionary violence and advocated for political and social change by other means.

Others, though still viewing themselves as operating within this new socialist discourse, held that the French Revolution's model still provided the surest way of establishing a more just order. Guiding these individuals were the writings of Philippe Buonarroti, an Italian noble who as a young man had served the Jacobins and participated in Gracchus Babeuf's failed "Conspiracy of Equals" in 1796. After spending the ensuing decades in various European cities, Buonarroti returned to Paris only weeks after the July Revolution and began compiling an account of his experiences during the Great Revolution. His book, widely distributed both before and following his death in 1837, provided a blueprint for those who viewed the Jacobins and Robespierre's policies as a

---

[62]Pierre Leroux, *De l'égalité précédé de De l'individualisme et du socialism* (Paris: Slatkine, 1996), 29. The term itself was first used in 1832 in the Saint-Simonian newspaper *Le Globe*, which was edited by Leroux.

[63]Pamela Pilbeam, *French Socialists before Marx: Workers, Women and the Social Question in France* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2000), 27.

revolutionary model universally applicable at all historical moments.[64] Auguste Blanqui, internalizing Buonarroti's brand of radicalism after meeting him in 1832, was obsessed with the Jacobin model and became the foremost advocate of organized, clandestine revolutionary action to realize a socialist republic.[65]

This growing prominence of a socialist discourse among Parisian radical circles marked a pivotal moment for non-French radicals within the city. While the various shades of "utopian," cooperative and revolutionary socialism contained diverse and often contradictory elements, all presented a revolutionary critique of the modern political economy. Though Paris in the 1830s and 1840s housed few proletarians in the Marxian sense, the city's numerous artisans and tradesmen, as well as its general laborers, felt threatened by the changing economic system prompted by the transnational capitalist order. As Sewell notes, these workers found themselves "financially squeezed, threatened with a loss of skill and status, and provided with virtually no legal form of collective defense against the disordering forces of the free market."[66] Non-French radicals and general immigrants underwent the same experiences as many French workers, given that most foreigners in Paris "lacked alternative means of support and had to accept whatever form of employment presented itself…(thus) blending in with the much larger mass of…artisans."[67] By observing, interacting, or experiencing this economic reality, early socialists in Paris developed a critical discourse that asserted "not

[64]See E. Eisenstein, *The First Professional Revolutionist: Filippo Michele Buonarroti* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1959). Pilbeam in *French Socialists Before Marx* describes Buonarroti's work as the "1830s equivalent of Mao's "Little Red Book," 30.
[65]Pilbeam, 33–35.
[66]Sewell, 161.
[67]Traugott, 160.

merely that capitalism was unjust, but that it appeared to work badly and, insofar as it worked, to produce the opposite results to those predicted by its champions," which clearly resonated with workers and radicals alike.[68]

This emergent socialist discourse made it possible to tie Paris's revolutionary tradition to an explicitly transnational critique. For non-French and French radicals alike, such discourse created space for a reimagining of the city's revolutionary potential, uncoupled from both 1789's vague internationalism or 1792's explicitly French Jacobinism. Though a substantial portion of French radicals, including many republicans and Robespierrians like Blanqui, continued to draw both inspiration and direction from the past, others began to view Paris's revolutionary potential through a much more expansive ideological lens. For these individuals, both foreign and French, Paris's revolutionary symbolism established the city as the best launching point for realizing radical change throughout the Continent and beyond. While socialists initially posited this vision of Paris's transformative potential, the denationalizing of the French capital's revolutionary tradition could and would be used by other radicals potentially to promote their own respective agendas.

Reimagining Paris's broader revolutionary significance outside of traditional French parameters did not mean an end to active collaboration between non-French radicals and their Parisian counterparts. Paris's serving as an international revolutionary catalyst necessitated first realizing revolution within both the city and France, meaning that those with differing ideological visions still shared a very immediate common cause. Thus, throughout the 1830s and 1840s French and non-French radicals continued to

[68]Hobsbawm, 242.

operate within the same Parisian radical networks, producing a vibrant exchange where ideas and philosophies were formed, challenged, and reformulated by virtue of a lively discourse.

Indeed, Paris during this period offered a further draw beyond its long-established position as Europe's revolutionary epicenter. For foreign radicals and intellectuals, Paris under the Louis Phillipe regime offered a relative oasis of official tolerance in comparison to the continent's other capitals and cities, despite its troubling exclusionary policies on suffrage and pro-business biases. Organizations, meetings, and publications that drew rapid police repression elsewhere generated much more moderate responses from the Orleanist police, who often (though not always) contented themselves with observation and note-taking.[69] Non-French radicals of various nationalities took great advantage of these more relaxed policies. For German radicals, Paris between 1834 and the early 1840s hosted a succession of revolutionary socialist organizations; beginning with Theodore Schuster's League of the Outlaws and followed (as the police cracked down on each) by the League of Germans and the League of the Just.[70] The Polish Democratic Society, which enjoyed the French government's tacit support, drew even more Poles from through Europe during this period. At the same time, more revolutionary offshoots, such as Polish People, offered more socialistic models for

---

[69]Lloyd S. Kramer, *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830-1848* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988), 6–7.

[70]James Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith* (New York: Basic, 1980), 183–85. Members of the League of the Just participated in Blanqui's unsuccessful uprising in May 1839. Following its failure, the French government banned the League and many of its members fled to London. In 1847 many of those former League members participated in Karl Marx's Communist League. See Bernard Moss, "Marx and the Permanent Revolution in France: Background to the Communist Manifesto," in *The Communist Manifesto Today: The Socialist Register, 1998*, ed., 147-67 (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998), 158.

Poland's liberation.[71] The result of this foreign influx mixing with established French radical networks was, according to Isaiah Berlin, a period for Paris "during which a richer international traffic in ideas, theories and personal sentiments was carried on…more striking and more articulate than at any time since the Renaissance."[72]

This moment, combining Paris's established revolutionary significance with its growing transnational potential, drew several individuals whose works would eventually define international radical thought and practice. Their presence and interaction in Paris during the formative periods in their respective careers illustrates both the vibrancy of the city's discourse as well as its centrality to the growing European socialist movement. The first, a twenty-five year old academic and lapsing Hegelian, arrived in October 1843 and established himself and his wife at 23 Rue Vaneau. Karl Marx came to Paris to examine French politics and economics, as well as the continued influence of the revolutionary tradition. His two years within the city and its environment proved transformative, marking, according to Berlin, the most "decisive" moment in his life and his final departure from Hegelianism in favor of historical materialism, socialism, and, ultimately, Communism.[73]

In addition to facilitating his intellectual transition from "philosopher to social theorist," Paris also brought Marx into contact with several other prominent French and non-French radicals, leading to exchanges that aided in delineating the future trajectory of the international socialist movement. His work on a German émigré newspaper for fellow German Arnold Ruge first brought him into contact with the Russian émigré

---

[71]Kisluk, 7–8.
[72]Isaiah Berlin, *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment* (New York: Princeton UP, 1978), 61.
[73]Ibid, 60.

Mikhail Bakunin. Travelling in similar circles in Paris, both men enjoyed a friendly relationship due to shared general principles; the deep ideological differences that would eventually tear international socialism asunder lay in the future.[74] During this same period Marx also encountered another future opponent, the mutualist/cooperative French socialist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. However, the most significant meeting for both Marx and the future of international radicalism occurred in Paris on August 23, 1844, at a café in Palais-Royal, when Marx first met his lifetime collaborator Friedrich Engels.[75] While Marx's time in Paris proved short, as he was expelled at the request of the Prussian government in February 1845, his presence, interactions, and the effect Paris had upon his ideological development illustrate the level of non-French and French collaboration during this period. Further, the attraction the French capital held for socialism's most prominent thinkers demonstrates its dual importance as a hallowed site of the revolutionary past and a potential starting point for a transnational revolutionary future.

By the mid-1840s, Paris unquestionably stood unchallenged as Europe's revolutionary capital. The legacy of 1789 combined with the French capital's contemporary manifestation as a forum for intellectual exchange and political discontent in a manner that drew international radicals from all corners of the Continent and beyond. As one scholar quite aptly observes, during this period "everyone interested in the theory or practice of revolution was bound sooner or later to come to Paris."[76] So well

---

[74]August Cornu, *Karl Marx et Friedrich Engels. Vol. 3, Marx à Paris* (Paris: PUF, 1962), 45; Kramer, 142–44; and Carr, 129–30.
[75]For an account of this meeting and its consequences, see August Nimtz, *Marx and Engels: Their Contribution to the Democratic Breakthrough* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 14–19. Also see Kramer, 130.
[76]Carr, 125.

established was Paris's place as Europe's radical cradle that even foreign governments took notice. The Czarist government declared the city completely "off limits" to its subjects and various German states began using "French influence" as a litmus test for identifying potential political malcontents.[77] Thus, as the midpoint of the nineteenth century approached, both reactionaries and radicals from Madrid to Moscow shared at least one common view. If and when Europe experienced a revolutionary conflagration, Paris would provide both the sparks and the tinder.

Exporting the Revolution: Paris in 1848

"The waves of the February Revolution rose high over the whole Continent, and each post brought a new bulletin of revolution, now from Italy, now from Germany, now from the remotest part of southeastern Europe."[78] So wrote Marx on the revolutionary storm that first broke in Paris and then spread across Europe in 1848. For the French capital's émigré community, this outbreak seemed to confirm their faith in both the city's continued revolutionary potential and, equally important, the capacity to harness that energy and export it throughout the Continent to address their own respective revolutionary aspirations. Furthermore, the fact that Paris's revolutionary sentiment spread unencumbered by the national baggage it had carried during the Great Revolution seemed to herald a new, genuinely transnational moment in Europe's revolutionary discourse.

---

[77]Kramer, 18–19.

[78]Karl Marx, "The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850," in Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France: From the February Revolution to the Paris Commune*, ed., 17-111 (Chippendale: Resistance Books, 2003), 50.

The period between 1846 and 1848 saw a series of a series of economic and agricultural crises that placed increasing strain on the Orleanist regime. The long-simmering issue of the limited franchise, coupled with the worsening conditions experienced by French workers, began manifesting in open discontent. Barred from most forms of association, in July 1847 middle class liberals and republicans began organizing banquets as thinly veiled forums for protest against the government. In Paris, various émigrés showed their support by joining these gatherings. Poles from the Democratic Society attended several events, believing a republican France constituted the best means of realizing a free and republican Poland. In October 1847, Friedrich Engels, acting as a correspondent for the English Chartist newspaper *The Northern Star*, travelled to the city and appeared at several Parisian banquets. Inspired by the political activism he witnessed, he asserted that each banquet "was in every respect more like a demonstration of the strength, both in number and intellect, of democracy at Paris, than anything else."[79] Clearly, Paris's non-French radicals sensed the transformative and potentially revolutionary sentiments within these public protests and wished to play an active role in the unfolding events.

By early 1848, the Orleanist regime came to view this expanding banquet movement (now drawing artisans and even workers to the events) with growing alarm. Alexis de Tocqueville, speaking before the Chamber of Deputies on January 27, 1848, cautioned, "We are sleeping together in a volcano. ... A wind of revolution blows, the

[79]Friedrich Engels, "The Reform Movement in France," in *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Collected Works, Vol. 6*, ed., 375-382 (New York: International, 1976), 375.

storm is on the horizon."[80] An attempt in mid-February 1848 to ban banquets as illegal political gatherings resulted in mass protests on February 22. By that evening barricades appeared throughout Paris, inaugurating two days of street fighting. Though the violence was brief, Parisian émigrés, sensing the potential of the moment, moved rapidly to participate in the uprising. At the very onset of fighting, Polish émigrés established themselves as firm supporters of the revolt. The Central Committee of the Democratic Society proclaimed their support of the revolutionaries, asserting that they, like their French counterparts, were "true representatives of republican principles," a commitment they soon demonstrated on the streets. Polish volunteers, veterans of the fighting in Warsaw in 1830, successfully organized the taking of a police barricade near the Palais Royal. Polish doctors set up triage stations just behind the barricades to care for the wounded. So notable was the Polish contribution that one French newspaper wrote of "the conduct of a large number of Poles" whose actions "during our beautiful days" added "a glorious page…to the history of that nation."[81] Germans figured prominently in the street fighting, gaining experience that established them (in their own assessment) as "barricade victors."[82] Italian and Belgian émigrés offered their services as well and fought beside their French comrades.[83] While no exact figure exists, contemporary accounts indicate that the number of non-French participants in the street fighting numbered in the thousands.[84] Interpreting the February uprising as marking a

---

[80]Quoted in Alexis de Tocqueville, *Alexis de Tocqueville on Democracy, Revolution, and Society*, ed. John Stone and Stephen Mennell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 11.
[81]Kisluk, 17–18.
[82]Louis Blaison, *Un Passage de vive force du Rhin français en 1848* (Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1933), 10.
[83]Traugott, 170, 172.
[84]Priscilla Robertson, *Revolutions of 1848: A Social History* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967), 171.

transformative political moment, Paris's non-French radicals eagerly joined the fighting in the hopes that revolutionary change within France would soon cascade throughout the Continent.

On February 25, 1848, a mix of liberals, moderate republicans, and radicals proclaimed a provisional Second Republic at Paris's Hôtel de Ville. Both French and non-French radicals initially greeted this announcement with euphoria, invoking as it did the Great Revolution's legacy by indirect reference to the First Republic of 1792. Orleanist limits on political expression and assembly were swept away by the new government, leading within days to a proliferation of new organizations. Clubs, the hallmark of revolutionary Parisian political culture, rapidly proliferated in the French capital. Among these groups were an array of émigré political organizations; with the German Association of Paris, the Democratic Iberian Club, and the Club of Polish Emigration comprising just a few.[85] Smaller exile communities, such as the Irish, Hungarians, and Greeks, also organized their own clubs. An almost electric atmosphere of revolutionary possibility seemed to permeate the entire city.

These halcyon days of unity proved short-lived. Despite this initial shared excitement, divisions rapidly arose among non-French radicals over how to maintain this revolutionary momentum and, more importantly, ensure its export to the rest of the Continent. On the one hand, many national groups within Paris's émigré community viewed events in France as a signal to organize in preparation for forcing change within their respective homelands by force of arms. Drawing on the model established by France's revolutionary armies in the 1790s, foreign radicals within Paris began

[85]Bourgin, 107.

organizing military legions to export the revolution by sparking wars of national liberation throughout Europe. For these men, realizing independence or unity upon national lines constituted a prerequisite to promoting republican, democratic, or socialistic principles.

In contrast, other non-French radicals asserted that promoting change on a continental scale required first establishing a successful revolutionary model within France. This émigré faction, though in the minority, viewed events in Paris through a lens informed by the early socialist movements' emphasis on realizing structural change through social, as well as political, reformulation. Their hope was that the February revolt marked the beginning of revolution in permanence, which would see France transition rapidly through liberal/bourgeois republicanism to working class rule/socialism. Marx, who would play an active role in the post-February period, describes this as continuing the revolutionary process "until all the more or less propertied classes have been driven from their ruling positions, until the proletariat has conquered state power."[86] The end product of this cycle would be a French Second Republic that was both democratic and social, and thus ideal for export throughout Europe and beyond.

The case of Paris's radical German émigré community in 1848 illustrates the tension between these two lines of thought. Immediately following the fighting in February, German veterans of the barricades began organizing themselves into volunteer

[86]Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League" in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker, 501–11 (New York: Norton, 1978). See also Bernard Moss, "Marx and Engels on French Social Democracy: Historians or Revolutionaries?" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46, no. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1985): 539-557, at 541–42.

legions to carry the revolution across the Rhine. These organizations shared the general goal of seeing the German lands unified under a model based upon France's 1792 First Republic. The exiled radical German poet Georg Herwegh, aided by his wife Emma, began gathering the different groups operating within Paris under the banner of the German Democratic Legion. Though Germans constituted the majority of the Legion, a smattering of French and other non-Germans enlisted in its ranks, including Mikhail Bakunin.[87] Initially popular with many Parisians due to its members' service in February, the Legion enjoyed financial and logistical support, as well as permission to drill in public places such as the Champ de Mars. As word arrived in early March of rising revolutionary sentiment in Baden, Herwegh began preparing to march his legion, staffed by veterans of the barricades, to spread Paris's revolutionary model to the German lands.[88]

Not all Germans in Paris shared Herwegh's view of exporting revolution by means of national-focused military interventions. Organizations such as the Communist League viewed the February Revolution as marking the onset of bourgeois republicanism, a necessary prerequisite for pressing the social and economic demands of French workers. By then winning this struggle, they hoped to produce a revolutionary model that would be emulated and thus challenge the capitalist order on a European-wide

---

[87]Bakunin returned to Paris on February 26, driven by his stated need to immerse himself in the "ecstatic atmosphere of revolution." After some initial contacts with Louis Blanc and other members of the Provisional Government, he agreed to serve Herwegh as a courier, carrying messages to the latter's contacts within the German lands. However, he became involved in other plots upon his arrival in the German lands. Between 1848 and 1849, he would be involved in revolutionary activities in Frankfurt, Berlin, Breslau, Prague, and Dresden. See Mikhail Bakunin, *The Confession of Mikhail Bakunin: with the Marginal Comments of Tsar Nicholas I*, trans. Robert C. Howes (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977), 55–68.
[88]Felix Ponteil, *1848* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1955), 82–8, Ralph Canevali, "The 'French False Alarm': Revolutionary Panic in Baden, 1848," *Central European History* 18, no. 2 (June 1985): 119-142, at 137–38; and Traugott, 171.

scale. Drawn by this possibility, Karl Marx, the leading figure within the Communist League, returned to Paris on March 5 at the invitation of the Provisional Government's socialist minister Ferdinand Flocon. Upon his arrival, Marx immersed himself in promoting a French republic deeply rooted in socialist principles by working with both German and French radicals within the city. He joined *Droits de l'homme*, one of the most prominent Parisian political clubs to emerge after February, and advised its members to "pressure the government against bourgeois influence and push it towards the socialist organization of labor." When the Provisional Government scheduled April elections, Marx counselled his French comrades to petition for a delay, arguing that a rapid vote precluded an effective campaign among the peasants in the provinces. Finally, to account for any potential duplicity by the Provisional Government, he urged French workers to arm themselves and prepare for the potential need to mount the barricades once again.[89]

Marx's involvement with Paris's French radicals did not preclude his continued work with German émigrés, particularly those affiliated with the Communist League. His first task focused on discouraging its members, as well as the larger expatriate community, from supporting or participating in military efforts like that proposed by Herwegh's Democratic Legion. Marx asserted that "an expedition from French soil with the clear backing of the French government would simply play into the hands of the German counterrevolution" by allowing them to frame republicanism and socialism as

[89]Moss, "Marx and the Permanent Revolution," 158–59. These positions promoted by Marx ironically mirrored those promoted by Blanqui, a frequent target after 1848 of criticism by Marx.

alien concepts being forced upon the German lands by a foreign power.[90] Instead, he encouraged German radicals to prepare for revolutionary outbreaks across the Rhine where the skills they acquired in Paris could be utilized. This involved, rather than military preparation, focus upon political organization and planning: establishing contacts in various German states; readying pamphlets and newspapers; and assuring that groups like the Communist League possessed the necessary infrastructure to promote their ideological vision. Marx and his comrades hoped that these steps would facilitate the permanent revolution model being realized each day before their eyes on the streets of Paris.[91]

Both of these revolutionary visions, however, just like those shared by French radicals within Paris, soon encountered serious difficulties. Those who sought to export revolution by force of arms came crashing to earth first. Herwegh's Legion, upon learning of an uprising in Baden on April 12, began marching toward the border. Despite receiving word of the Baden revolutionaries' defeat on April 20, Herwegh, fired by his revolutionary vision, crossed the border on April 23. Four days later, Badenese soldiers easily defeated the Legion near Dossenbach, leaving Herwegh and the few not killed or captured to flee toward the Swiss border.[92] As Marx had predicted, not only had the military campaign fail but it also enabled Badenese officials to label their indigenous revolutionaries as foreign agents and thus undercut their efforts.

---

[90]Nimtz, 63.
[91]Ibid, 64–65.
[92]Jacques Droz, *Les révolutions allemandes de 1848* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957), 239–42 provides a detailed account of the Legion's debacle. See also Canevali, "False French Alarm," 140–41.

Other national-based military efforts by Parisian émigrés came to similar ends. Belgian veterans of the February barricades also hoped to export revolution to their homeland and overthrow Leopold I's regime (the son-in-law of the recently deposed Louis-Philippe). Holding demonstrations in Paris to draw volunteers, the Belgian Legion enjoyed, unlike their German counterpart, the direct support of the French Provisional Government and thus had access to funds, arms, and even a special train to take them to the Belgian frontier in late March. However, like Herwegh's force, they lacked organization and discipline, as well as popular support, and upon crossing into Belgium they were easily routed by the royal army.[93]

A similar situation developed among Paris's Savoyard community. In March, these Savoyards petitioned the Provisional Government to annex Savoy outright to both liberate it from Piedmontese control and provide the virtues of republican government. When the French demurred, a 1500-man legion marched from Paris into Savoy in early April, intent on declaring a republic. However, so ill-prepared and equipped was this force that an ad hoc local militia easily drove these would-be revolutionaries back across the border with barely a shot fired.[94] In all three cases, despite their experiences in Paris's February revolt, these armed émigré prophets failed to export revolution by means of military intervention. Poor and hasty planning, coupled with limited popular support in their respective homelands, served to doom these efforts and thus discredit this model for spreading Paris's revolutionary spirit.

[93]Traugott, 172–73. Perhaps the most memorable element of the ill-fated expedition was the fact that the Flemish town where it was brought to heel was aptly named Risquons-Tout ("Let's Risk it All).
[94]Ibid, 170–71.

However, one case involving this intervention-based revolutionary template among Paris's émigré communities warrants special attention, that of the Poles. Unlike the Germans and Belgians, the Polish exiles enjoyed an existing organizational infrastructure through groups like the Democratic Society. Since their arrival in the early 1830s, these organizations had planned for the possibility of using France as a launching point for an armed effort to free their homeland. Rather than depending on starry-eyed romantics like Herwegh for leadership, the Polish émigrés could draw on a cadre of military veterans. Given this preparation, immediately following the February fighting Poles began raising armed legions throughout the French capital. Prominent Polish émigrés like Adam Mickiewicz aided in rallying men to the colors. French radicals also provided substantial aid in these efforts. Political clubs, such as the Club fraternel des Quinze-Vingts and the Club Républicain de Batignolles, held collections and provided substantial financial backing to arm and equip these men. More importantly, the Provisional Government appeared in full support of the Polish legions, even promising pensions for the wives and children of Polish patriots left behind in Paris. Inspired by these events, the first Polish volunteers began marching out of Paris at the end of March, confident that they carried the full support of revolutionary Paris and France in their campaign of liberation.[95]

As these Polish revolutionaries began their march eastward, political currents within Paris shifted, threatening the revolutionary momentum necessary for the Poles and other non-French radicals to realize their respective goals. Marx and other socialist activists held, as opposed to the military interventionists, that Paris's revolution must be

[95]Kisluk, 44–47.

won prior to its export beyond France's borders. When Marx and several of his émigré comrades left Paris in early April for the German lands, this process seemed to be moving forward admirably. Prompted by socialist Louis Blanc, the Provisional Government established a labor commission at the Luxembourg palace. Led by Blanc, this commission created a system of national workshops both to address the immediate crisis of unemployment and to set the groundwork for establishing government-supported workers' cooperatives. This created an autonomous institution within a government dominated completely by radicals and workers, thus producing, along with the clubs, an alternative power structure capable of challenging the existing economic and political order.[96] In addition, the Provisional Government also limited working hours, created public employment agencies, and outlawed production using convict labor.[97] Sewell characterizes this flurry of political activity, a constant dialogue of demands and responses between the workers and the Provisional Government, as "adding up to the launching of a genuine social revolution."[98] The groundwork for permanent revolution, characterized by the shift from bourgeois to worker control, seemed to be prepared.

However, the situation shifted in April as the Provisional Government prepared for elections. Despite the advances being made by Parisian workers, the large rural majority within France experienced few benefits from the revolution and had little contact with its proponents or culture. As a result, the elections held on April 23

---

[96]Sewell argues that the combination of the clubs and the Luxembourg Commission presented a perfect example of "dual power" as articulated by Leon Trotsky. Trotsky argued that such institutions were necessary to realize a revolution in permanence by challenging more conservative institutions meant to slow or halt the revolution's momentum prior to its final stage. See Sewell, 254.
[97]Bernard Moss, *The Origins of the French Labor Movement, 1830–1914: The Socialism of Skilled Workers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 41–42.
[98]Sewell, 244.

produced an assembly dominated by conservatives and moderate republicans. These new representatives began taking measures to curtail the economic and social reordering favored by Paris's radical circles. They rejected Blanc's call for the creation of a Ministry of Labor and Progress and began expressing concerns over the costs being incurred by the Luxembourg Commission's national workshops.[99] These actions greatly alarmed both French and non-French radicals, who viewed these measures as aimed at preventing the revolutionary restructuring of the economic and social order. To combat these efforts, the Paris clubs, in conjunction with several émigré organizations, planned a large pro-Polish demonstration for May 15. Their goals were two-fold: to press the National Assembly to take action against Prussia and Russia on Poland's behalf and, more importantly, to demonstrate forcefully that the Revolution would not be halted in its transformation of both France and Europe.[100]

On May 15, both the Paris clubs and Polish émigré organizations, including the Democratic Society, turned out in strength on the streets. They timed their actions to coincide with a major debate in the Assembly over potentially aiding Polish revolutionaries attempting to assert control in Prussia's Posen province.[101] Drawing nearly 40,000 demonstrators to the Place de la Bastille, the demonstrators then marched upon the National Assembly, meeting in the Palais Bourbon. Initially demanding the floor to petition on behalf of the Poles, the crowd eventually forced its way into the National Assembly and declared it dissolved, thus beginning a half-hearted *journée*

---

[99]Judt, 78–79, and Moss, *Origins*, 42.
[100]Kisluk, 86–87.
[101]Including among those participating in this uprising were the Polish legions (including a handful of French volunteers as well) from Paris that had left the city during March and early April. See Traugott, 360.

against the new government. Following their taking of the Palais Bourbon, the crowd proceeded to occupy the Hôtel de Ville as well, until the arrival of loyal National Guard troops led to their rapid dispersal.[102]

May 15 proved a turning point for both Paris's French and non-French radicals. For the non-French, particularly the Poles, the attempted *journée* explicitly tied their causes to that of the city's radicals.[103] Correspondingly, support within the new government for any effort to export the revolution rapidly dwindled. Furthermore, foreign radicals still active within Paris were viewed with a suspicious if not outright hostile eye by the government's security forces. For French radicals, May 15 proved both a disaster and watershed moment. In the ensuing days, police arrested the majority of radical leaders, including Louis Blanqui and François Raspail, and placed the clubs under greater surveillance. More ominously, the conservative-dominated National Assembly began targeting the Luxembourg Commission's reform efforts, making clear their intention to bring the revolution to a quick end. United in the effort to bring down the Orleanist regime, Paris bourgeois republicans and radicals, both foreign and French alike, stood on opposing sides of an ideological fissure rapidly growing into a chasm.

The struggle of Parisian French and non-French radicals to realize a revolution in permanence, culminating in a new economic and social order, reached an apex in June

---

[102]A detailed account and analysis of the May 15 protest is providing in Peter Amann, "A 'Journée' in the Making: May 15, 1848," *The Journal of Modern History* 42, no. 1 (March 1970): 42–69.

[103]Most of the city's Poles viewed the events of May 15 as an unmitigated disaster. While many Poles initially participated in the demonstration, the majority, upon realizing its intent to overthrow the government, withdrew themselves, fearing (rightfully) the association of their cause with that of the protesters if their efforts failed. In the following days, the Central Committee of the Democratic Society issued a statement expressing its solidarity with the protesters' principles while at the same time condemning their methods. The more conservative factions within the Polish émigré community were much more direct in their criticisms of the protestors and openly professed their support of the arrest of radical leaders in the days following May 15. See Kisluk, 89–92.

1848. The conservative-dominated government, supported by many bourgeois republicans, now viewed institutions like the Luxembourg Commission and the National Workshops as a threat to property rights and a potential launching point for a new Terror on the 1792 model, for which the events of May 15 were only a prelude. To this end, on June 21 the government ordered the closing of the National Workshops and the removal of unemployed labor from the capital. For radicals and workers, the National Workshops constituted the first step in realizing a new economic and social order.[104] The closing provided a clear indication that the revolution was in mortal danger. Left with little choice, on June 22, 1848, Paris's workers and radicals, French and foreign alike, began constructing barricades throughout the city.

Though fewer in number than in February due to participation in their own respective national revolutions, émigré radicals once again joined their French comrades in the street fighting. Foreign radicals recognized that just as France's initial revolution spurred a continental wave of uprisings its suppression would work similarly in favor of reaction and understood that their own ideological aspirations were also at risk. Furthermore, no other national revolution produced institutions, such as the Luxembourg Commission and the National Workshops, which constituted the necessary foundation for the realization of the social republic. Thus, for Paris's international radicals, Europe's only model for revolution in permanence hung in the balance as fighting along Paris's streets commenced on June 23.

For three days, Paris's workers, radicals, and émigré insurgents clashed with both the army and bourgeois units of the city's National Guard. The bulk of the fighting

[104]Sewell, 271–72, and Moss, *Origins*, 43.

centered in the city's eastern and northern districts, particularly around Clichy, La Chapelle, and La Villette, although two other major pockets developed around the Hôtel de Ville and in the Latin Quarter.[105] The majority of foreign combatants appear to have manned barricades in the north and west, the sites of the fiercest fighting. The intensity of the fighting eclipsed anything seen in Paris during earlier nineteenth-century revolts. By June 26, between 1500 and 2000 of the 10,000–20,000 insurgents had been killed. While the exact number of émigrés engaged is unknown, their presence among those arrested indicates their prominence in the uprising. Of the 11,709 arrested during the June Days, over 7 percent (833 in total) were foreign-born. Belgians and Germans, despite the drain of the legion efforts and participation in their own national revolutions, constituted the majority of those foreigners arrested. Polish émigrés, despite their active participation in Parisian radical circles and prominence in earlier uprisings, numbered fewer than 10 among those arrested.[106] Though the number serving abroad in the volunteer legions accounts for this in part, it appears that many Poles, including members of the Democratic Society, were hedging their bets during the June Days. Painfully aware of the suspicion generated by May 15, most Polish exiles, despite sympathizing with the insurgents, stayed away from the barricades. In the aftermath, several Polish publications (somewhat sheepishly) asserted that their remaining on the sidelines during

[105]Harsin, 299–303. A map of the insurgent areas, calculated by arrest rate, can be found in Roger Gould, *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 52–53.

[106]For a detailed statistical analysis of the participants in the June Days by categories, see Charles Tilly and Lynn Lees, "Le peuple de Juin 1848," *Annales* XXIX (1974): 1061-1091, at1080–82.

the fighting left them still capable of supporting the republic in the case of a reactionary backlash.[107]

However, for the majority of Paris's French and non-French radicals, the June Days marked a turning point in both the city's revolutionary tradition and in the larger trajectory of Europe's transnational radical movement. The idea of realizing a democratic and social republic from above by means of cooperating with bourgeois republicans in government died along with the victims of the June Days. Marx, analyzing this moment in *The Class Struggles in France*, asserts that "by making its burial place the birthplace of the bourgeois republic, the proletariat compelled the latter to come out forthwith in its pure form as the state whose admitted object it is to perpetuate the rule of capital, the slavery of labor."[108] Modern scholars, though not convinced that Marx's characterization of class divisions within France is accurate, do agree, as Tony Judt notes, that the June Days provided "the impetus for a qualitative leap in political consciousness."[109]

This schism between bourgeois republicanism, and the democratic and social agenda of radicals found strong resonance among Paris's remaining non-French radicals, particularly as they viewed the French effort in the context of other European revolutions. Most of Paris's radical émigré communities perceived that their respective national revolutions had failed either due to their bourgeoisie's political tepidness or as a result of the bourgeoisie's fears of social revolution causing "it to league itself openly with the

---

[107]According to Kisluk, several dozen conservative Polish émigrés (those supporting an independent Poland under a monarchy) actually fought on the side of the National Guard during the June Days. See Kisluk, 104–05.
[108]Marx, *Class Struggle*, 55.
[109]Judt, 84.

feudal monarchy against the people."[110] In the Polish case, this manifested when the bourgeois-dominated Frankfurt Parliament sided with the Prussian Crown against Poland's call for an independent state based around Posen. Many Poles felt betrayed by the Parliament's actions, believing that their common adherence to republican principles should have trumped nationalist calculations. This disillusionment culminated in armed clashes between the Polish legions and Prussian military in early 1849, ultimately ending with the Poles' defeat and surrender in May.[111]

In the German context, the above mentioned Frankfurt Parliament, dominated by bourgeois republicans and liberals, initially provided hope for German radicals like Marx and Engels that the French model for revolution in permanence was spreading. However, by September 1848 this Parliament began balking at demands for real democratic reform, as well as demonstrating a growing willingness to make common cause with the Prussian military against perceived radicals throughout the German lands. By the early months of 1849, many radical German veterans of Paris's street fighting found themselves on the barricades once again, facing the Prussian army in a series of unsuccessful uprisings throughout the German lands.[112] Paris-based émigrés from other states, such as Belgium, Hungary, and Ireland, saw their national efforts come to similar ends.

However, as Europe's revolutionary tide began receding by early 1849, many foreign radicals once again looked to Paris to renew the revolution's momentum. Despite

---

[110]Marx, *Class Struggle,* 56.

[111]The handling of the Polish question in the Parliament is recorded in Friedrich Engels, "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question," *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* No. 70, August 1848. A brief account of the Polish uprising in Posen and defeat is included in William J. Orr, Jr., "East Prussia and the Revolution of 1848," *Central European History*,13, no. 4 (December 1980): 303-331, at 312, 318. Nearly 1500 Poles, including volunteers from both Paris and Berlin, were held by the Prussians and only released after having their heads shaved and being branded.

[112]Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005), 228–31.

the violence of the June Days, the Second Republic endured. Though dominated by bourgeois republicans and conservatives, it still introduced a republican constitution in November 1848 that allowed for presidential and legislative elections via universal manhood suffrage. Though the December elections swept Louis-Napoleon into the presidency, parliamentary elections in May 1849 showed strong returns for the leftist coalition led by the neo-Jacobin socialist Alexandre Ledru-Rollin.[113] While many Parisian radicals remained suspicious of Ledru-Rollin due to his support of the government during the June Days, his *démoc-socs* coalition's electoral success stood as a lone radical advance in a revolutionary Europe rapidly succumbing to reaction.

This moment of possibility produced a resurgence of émigré political activity within Paris. As revolutionary movements within their respective homelands failed, many non-French radicals began returning to Paris, drawn to the city both by experience and its continued revolutionary potential in comparison to the rest of the Continent. As Poles returned from the failed national liberation efforts in Posen and Galicia the Democratic Society once again became active. Other national émigré groups also reemerged at this time and in May, bolstered by the French elections, began discussions of establishing a Paris-based alliance of European revolutionary movements.[114] Germans, particularly from Baden and the Rhineland, were well-represented in those discussions and in Paris as a whole by May. Karl Marx numbered among these German

---

[113]Ledru-Rollins's electoral coalition has been the subject of much debate. Marx and Marxists have long dismissed it as an example of petty bourgeois republicanism. However, more recent scholarship has revisited this electoral movement, characterizing it as genuine Democratic-Socialist movement maligned in large part due to having a predominately rural base. See Robert Tombs, "Inventing Politics: From Bourbon Restoration to Republican Monarchy," in *French History since Napoleon*, ed. Martin Alexander, 59–68 (New York: Oxford UP, 1999).

[114]Kisluk, 202.

radical refugees. With the German revolutionary effort waning, he travelled to the French capital, like many other radical activists, "to see what the prospects were for a French impulse to the European revolution."[115] This belief that Paris, which gave birth to the revolutionary surge in February 1848, might breathe second life into the international movement was not limited to émigrés operating with the city's radical circles. The French capital also hosted several delegations from different insurgent governments, all petitioning the Second Republic for military aid. The entire European revolutionary effort appeared once again to hinge upon events in the Continent's radical metropole.

Paris's ideological pendulum, despite these radical hopes, arced firmly to the right by early June. Under pressure from the conservative and monarchist majority in the Assembly and among his ministers, President Louis-Napoleon firmly declined the calls for France's military intervention on behalf of the Continent's revolutionary movements. Rather, he ordered French expeditionary forces into the newly established Roman Republic to intervene to restore Papal authority. This action incensed the Leftist coalition within the Assembly, which asserted that the President's actions violated the clause in the 1848 Constitution that prohibited French military action against other republican states.[116] Blocked from parliamentary action by the Party of Order, Ledru-Rollin and his parliamentary comrades called for a mass demonstration on June 13 against the government.

This crisis divided Paris's radical community, French and non-French alike. While all opposed Louis-Napoleon's intervention in Rome, many distrusted Ledru-Rollin

[115]Nimtz, 101.
[116]Sperber, 250–51.

and his fellow parliamentarians, who had largely either supported the government or stood on the sidelines during the June Days. German radicals, particularly those with connections to Marx, viewed the call for mass action as "the insurrection of the democratic petty bourgeoisie" and advised their ranks to avoid participating.[117] Polish émigrés, particularly members of the Democratic Society, viewed the June 13 demonstration as marking the French republicanism's moment of crisis. This, along with the Louis Napoleon government's anti-republican intervention in Rome, prompted various Polish publications and organizations to speak openly in favor of the June 13 demonstration and encourage its supporters to take to the streets.[118]

Ultimately, the demonstration of June 13, 1849 proved a debacle, as well as the swan song, for both revolutions in Paris and the city's primacy for the mid-century European revolutionary movement. With the memory of the June Days still fresh, most Parisian workers, radicals, and émigrés failed to turn out, resulting in a demonstration easily dispersed by a far superior number of soldiers and National Guardsmen.[119] Though the Second Republic clung to life for another two years, the ebbing of its revolutionary potent began in June 1848 rapidly declined following the June 13, 1849, fiasco.

Paris's international radical community, demoralized by this failure, experienced a decline as well. The French government accelerated this process. Louis-Napoleon's

---

[117]Marx, *Class Struggles*, 87.
[118]Kisluk, 202.
[119]The 6,000–8,000 protestors on June 13 were opposed by roughly 20,000 soldiers and the National Guard. Most of the demonstration's leaders were arrested on the spot, though Ledru-Rollin managed to escape and take refuge in London. The only real violence in June 1849 was in Lyon, where the city's silk workers, in conjunction with local republicans, fought on the barricades until defeated by the Army. See Sperber, 251.

administration, spurred by the Conservative Assembly, declared Paris was in a state of siege following June 13 and began moving against the Left. Though French radicals bore the brunt, police heavily cracked down on the city's émigré community. Hundreds of German radicals, particularly those from Baden and the Rhineland, were expelled in the ensuing months. Poles, particularly the leaders of the Democratic Society and veterans of revolutions abroad, experienced similar treatment. Over eighty prominent Poles received expulsion orders by the end of 1849.[120] Though expulsions likely numbered in the thousands, a majority of those non-French radicals leaving Paris did so of their own accord. Most, like Karl Marx in August 1849, recognized that with the defeat of France's revolution the larger revolutionary effort on the Continent had little to no prospects. Hence they abandoned Paris for less politically risky abodes, either in London or the United States.[121] Tied by both ideology and actions to a revolutionary spirit viewed with increasing hostility by the Second Republic, émigré radicals saw Paris transformed from a site of political possibility to just another European city under the thrall of reaction.

Louis-Napoleon's December 1851 *coup d'état*, like that of his uncle's fifty-two years earlier, once again inaugurated a period of dormancy in Paris's primacy as a transnational revolutionary center. Nevertheless, 1848 marked a moment of evolution in the radical understanding of ideology, revolution, and potential approaches for the future. In terms of radical ideological development, Paris produced the conditions in 1848 whereby, as Sewell notes, "socialism first took shape as a mass movement."[122] The

[120]Kisluk, 187–91.
[121]As Nimtz notes, London, with its less regressive police, provided a site where Marx and others could assess and learn from the failures of 1848–1849. See Nimtz, 101.
[122]Sewell, 275.

Luxembourg Commission, the National Workshops, as well as the shared experiences on the barricades, served to create a key moment in political identity formation. Given its origins in this discourse of experience and oppression, rather than material economic conditions, many émigré radicals played a role in this process of ideological formation. Thus their perceptions of Paris's revolutionary significance (as well as those they would convey to future generations of radicals) became associated with socialist tenants in at least a basic form. This furthered the process, begun in the 1830s, of moving Paris's revolutionary identity beyond the specific French context toward operating within a much more explicitly transnational discourse.

In terms of making revolution, events in Paris during 1848 taught several vital lessons to French and non-French radicals alike. The June Days illustrated that the moment for radicals to make common cause with the bourgeoisie had passed. As Roger Gould states, the June Days marked "when paving stones and rifles drew with such clarity the boundary between the bourgeois Paris of the west and the proletarian Paris of the east."[123] This experience echoed those of foreign radicals who left Paris in pursuit of their own national revolutionary goals and endured, such as in the German case, bourgeois republicans exhibiting meekness, duplicity, or some combination of the two. Members of the Polish Democratic Society, in assessing their experiences in both Paris and Posen from their new exile in London, concluded that "only revolutions or wars would bring changes to the political status quo in Europe."[124] This perspective endured

[123]Gould, 61.

[124]Kisluk, 203–05. Following its expulsion from Paris, the Polish Democratic Society went into decline, as members fell away to join other groups or emmigrated to the United States. It completely faded out of existence by the mid-1850s. However, Bronislaw Wolowski, one of its prominent members, would return

in Parisian radical circles and was conveyed over the ensuing years to younger native and émigré activists.

One final lesson from 1848 applied particularly to émigré radicals who, despite their disappointments, still viewed Paris as the most likely origin point for a successful revolutionary wave in the future. Rather than waiting to assure the revolution's consolidation in Paris following February's victory, too many of the city's émigrés had moved immediately to their own national projects. By the June Days, when the reactionary response against the revolution's more radical policies began in the streets, thousands of Poles, Germans, Belgians, and others had already marched to their homelands in well-meaning but ultimately unsuccessful attempts to spread the revolution even before it was won in Paris. Thus, when these national revolutionary efforts reached their respective crisis points in late 1848 and early 1849, Paris provided, rather than a needed ally, the seat of a conservative republican government committed to aiding anti-revolutionary forces abroad, as the intervention against the Roman Republican demonstrated. Events would show that this experience was not lost on international radicals drawn by Paris's next revolutionary manifestation in 1870–1871. This could be accounted for in part due to the waning of revolutionary nationalism after 1848, with the ensuing twenty years seeing national projects being "accomplished by the industrial-military-diplomatic strength of established states (such as Piedmont and Prussia) rather

---

to Paris in the 1860s, interacting frequently with the post-1863 Uprising generation of Polish émigrés, including Jaroslav Dombrowski. See also Woodford McClellan, *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (London: Frank Cass, 1979), 134–35.

than by romantic revolt in the name of a new national ethos."[125] However, nearly all foreign participants in the Commune, including the three discussed in the ensuing chapters of this dissertation, viewed a decisive victory in Paris as being a necessary prerequisite for realizing their respective revolutionary projects. The experience of 1848 largely informed them in this regard.

Oppression, Reconstruction, and the International: Paris under the Second Empire

The first decade of the Second Empire saw Paris's international radical community (and foreign population in general) decline to its lowest point since the first Napoleon's reign. Jacques Grandjonc's study of French immigration between 1830 and 1851 provides quantitative proof of this decline. According to his data on Paris's immigrant population in December 1846 and then during the 1851 Census, the city witnessed a massive drop in its foreign residents. From a total of over 168,000 prior to the revolution, by the last days of the Second Republic only a third, roughly 51,000, still resided in the city. Those groups most heavily involved in revolutionary activities during 1848–1849 saw the most dramatic drop: The Polish and Belgian populations declined by half and the German population dropping from a height of 59,334 to a mere 13,584.[126] An economic downturn beginning in 1847, which limited employment opportunities within the city, can account for this in part. However, the combination of foreigners returning home in 1848 to spread the revolution or leaving (in some cases involuntarily) when France's revolutionary moment ended in favor of reaction constitutes a major factor as well,

---

[125]Billington, 324–25. The Polish Uprising against Russia in 1863, in which Chapter Four's focus Jaroslav Dombrowski played a prominent role, presents perhaps the last major example of romantic, revolutionary nationalism.

[126]Jacques Grandjonc, "Eléments statistiques pour une étude de l'immigration étrangère en France de 1830 à 1851," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 15 (1975): 211-300, 234.

particularly within radical circles. The antisocialist measures employed following Louis Napoleon's coup likely furthered this exodus. For the bulk of the 1850s, Paris mirrored other European cities in being highly unfavorable to radical activity of any sort.[127]

Ultimately, it would be Louis-Napoleon's grand vision of a new Paris that would first reopen the city to a new foreign influx. Beginning in 1860, Georges Haussmann, Prefect of the Seine, undertook at his emperor's behest a massive rebuilding and modernization project, aimed at making Paris the showpiece of the Second Empire. This Herculean undertaking required armies of laborers, including specialists not available in the necessary numbers within France. As a result, huge numbers of foreign workers entered the city over the course of the 1860s. While exact figures are unknown, Germans clearly constituted the largest group, though immigrants from all corners of Europe appeared in significant numbers, attracted by a project that at its peak employed over 20 percent of Paris exclusively in its efforts.[128] While initially drawn by the promise of work, many of these foreign laborers brought with them connections to various worker's and socialist organizations or experiences from 1848. Napoleon III and Haussmann both recognized this potential threat but were willing to take the risk in exchange for the necessary labor to complete the project. Moreover, they viewed this risk as calculated, since one of the major goals of Paris's rebuilding was "to make an ungovernable city governable" by removing narrow streets in favor of wide boulevards unfavorable to barricade construction.[129] Nevertheless, Haussmannization provided Paris with a new

[127]Moss, *Origins of the French Labor Movement,* 48–49.
[128]Robert Tombs, *The Paris Commune 1871* (New York: Longman, 1999), 23.
[129]Jeanne Gallard, *Paris la Ville, 1852–1870* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1997), 2.

non-French population aware of both the city's revolutionary legacy and capable of becoming a revolutionary force under the correct circumstances.

While Louis-Napoleon's vision of a modern French capital inaugurated a new wave of general immigration to the city, events in London set the stage for the next chapter in Paris's history as Europe's revolutionary center. London (mirrored to a lesser degree by Geneva) had long played a complementary role to Paris's position as a revolutionary center. Unlike most major European states, Britain did not experience any major revolutionary upheavals during either the Great Revolution or at any time during the nineteenth century. While this fact frustrated many radicals, who perceived industrially advanced Britain as the most logical site for a revolt of the oppressed, it also meant that the British government lacked the hostile policies toward political exiles that other European states possessed. As Sabine Freitag notes, "Britain not only had liberal asylum legislation," which prevented extradition for political offenses, "it also lacked any regulations that curbed the steam of refugees."[130] While Marx constitutes the most prominent radical who took advantage of these policies, thousands of other did as well. In the case of those focused on Paris, London provided a site free from reaction's reach yet close enough to the French capital to return at the first shift in the political wind.

In 1862 London's role as a radical refuge had a more direct effect on Parisian politics, as the British capital hosted an International Exhibition to promote industry and commerce. Napoleon III permitted a delegation of 750 workers to attend this event, where they established contacts with British trade unionists (as well as Italians and

[130]Sabine Freitag, "Introduction," in *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England*, ed. Sabine Freitag, 1-18 (London: Berghahn, 2003), at 3.

Poles). This relationship deepened in 1863, as radical representatives from both countries advocated in favor of Poland's uprising. Ultimately, this produced a meeting on September 28, 1864, between British, French, German, Polish, and Italian representatives that produced the International Working Men's Association.[131] This, as Bernard Moss notes, marked a transitional moment in the history of both European radicalism and labor, an international association that "shared sentiments of class solidarity and concern for social justice" that "through mutual discussion and experience…became a crucible in which the practices of English trade socialism, French cooperation, and German Communism were fused into a common program."[132] Karl Marx, the three-time Paris émigré, served as the organizations' *de facto* chief organizer and theorist.

The importance of the International's founding for Paris's future revolutionary trajectory, particularly in relation to non-French radicals, cannot be overstated. The International synthesized the various positions of European radicals into a critique of capitalism that knew no borders and viewed the unity of all workers as a prerequisite for realizing revolutionary change. While radical discourse since 1789 had spoken of vague universal values, the International provided a concrete discourse that was transnational in both nature and scope. In terms of Paris's significance, this meant that, in the case a new revolutionary moment arose, the city's radicals, both French and émigré, possessed the language, perspective, and organization to view that event within a truly international context. While specifically Parisian and French conditions would likely dictate any initial rupture, the existence of this internationalist radical discourse meant that Paris's

[131]Nimtz provides a detailed discussion of the First International's founding, see Nimtz, 169–82.
[132]Moss, *Origins of the French Labor Movement*, 74.

revolution could be understood as "a new and important stage in the course of progress"[133] for workers and radicals on a global scale. Even among radicals who rejected the International its very existence served to redefine the general parameters of discourse, forcing them to view their respective radical projects within a broader, internationalist framework.[134] Essentially, the International's founding meant that non-French radicals possessed a blueprint, a means to view Paris's next revolution as a direct first step in realizing a new international order, one that would unquestionably address their own particular aspirations.

The evidence of the International's effect on Paris's non-French radical and worker population rapidly became apparent following the organization's founding. Within a year of the official founding of the International's first section in Paris, sections of émigrés began appearing, with the first German section in Paris founded in late 1866 or early 1867. Sections of Belgian, Italian, and Hungarian workers developed soon after, and the workers brought in by Haussmann provided a ready pool of potential recruits.[135] Through these sections of the International, all operating within a federated system under the central direction of the Paris branch, a new Parisian radical network began to emerge and establish new connections between French and non-French activists. Furthermore, even those radicals and activists who did not directly join these sections interacted with their members through their interactions in shared networks. While many from the new

[133]*Journal Officiel de la Commune de Paris du 20 mars au 24 mai 1871* (Paris, 1872), March 21, 1871.
[134]Even during the Commune's last weeks, when the Neo-Jacobin dominated Committee of Public Safety held sway, its members still utilized a much more internationalist language in addressing the Commune's significance that was the case under the original Jacobins in 1792.
[135]Jacques Rougerie, "L'A.I.T. et le mouvement ouvrier à Paris pendant les événements de 1870–1871," *International Review of Social History* 17, no. 1 (April 1972): 10–13.

wave of Polish exiles, arriving in the aftermath of the failed 1863 uprising, did not join the International, they traveled in similar circles within Paris and established both political and personal connections with its members.[136]

The International's emergence proved an important addition to the Parisian political landscape for non-French radicals. Defining factions within the Parisian radical community during the Second Empire's waning years can be difficult, given that individuals often identified with more than one position or no position at all. However, by 1870 it is possible to identify several rough groupings within the Parisian radical community. While shared opposition to Louis Napoleon created a general sense of comradery among all Parisian radicals, some of these groups possessed tendencies that, particularly under circumstances of stress, made them potentially more or less amicable to Paris's émigré radicals. Obviously the International's Paris Branch constituted the clique most welcoming to radicals of all nations. Similarly the Blanquists, defined by adherence to their namesake's model of revolutionary conspiracy, showed no evidence of possessing any biases regarding a radical's nation of origin, though ideological differences with Internationalists close to Marx and the General Council were common. Indeed, several prominent Blanquists, including Emile Duval and Victor Jaclard, became active members of the International's French Branch during the late 1860s and collaborated effectively with its foreign members during their shared opposition to Louis-Napoleon's regime.[137]

---

[136]As is shown in Jaroslav Dombrowski's case, see Chapter 4.
[137]Edwards, 383–85.

Potentially more problematic for non-French radicals was the radical republican faction commonly referred to as the neo-Jacobins. Consciously modeling themselves after the Jacobins of the Great Revolution, these neo-Jacobins advocated a strong centralized government led by a revolutionary dictatorship and a controlled economy. Though some its members, such as the 1848 veteran Charles Delescluze, collaborated effectively with foreign radicals, this group also included many adherents who deeply embraced, as David Shaffer notes, the "chauvinistic republican nationalism" that proved so problematic for émigré radicals in 1792.[138] The Proudhonists also presented some potential problems, particularly for émigré female radicals. While some conflict with non-French radicals (such as Leo Frankel) originated from their ideological rejection of Proudhon's vision of federalist anarchism and decentralized production, female radicals found their very right to participate in politics and activism questioned. As Carolyn Eichner states, the Proudhonian position in the years prior to the Commune "attempted to re-enact the ideological efforts of the 1790s to banish women from public life."[139] However, these differences remained largely masked during the late 1860s as all radical factions stood united in their cobelligerency toward Louis Napoleon's regime.

Facilitated by the relative tolerance of the Second Empire's "liberal phase" in the late 1860s, non-French radicals, aided by the new networks established by the International, once again began establishing themselves as an integral part of Paris's activist community. Drawn in part by the growing cracks apparent within Louis Napoleon's regime's façade, this new generation of émigrés, including Leo Frankel and

[138]Shaffer, 18.
[139]Eichner, 41.

Jaroslav Dombrowski, joined previous generations of non-French radicals in hoping that Paris would again prove the catalyst for a new revolutionary wave. Though driven by different aspirations and ideological visions, like all foreign radicals coming to Paris since 1789, they viewed this capital of both France and revolution as the site most likely to produce the transformative forces necessary to realize their respective aspirations. This expectation would inform the city's non-French radicals as 1870 saw a new crisis, with war and siege producing a new revolutionary moment in Paris culminating in the Commune.

As this chapter has demonstrated, the perspectives of this dissertation's subjects, Leo Frankel, Elisabeth Dmitrieff, and Jaroslav Dombrowski, were informed by the experiences of earlier generations of non-French radicals in Paris, beginning with the Great Revolution in 1789. From the onset, Paris drew these foreigners by its promise as an international revolutionary center, a site capable of both fostering revolution and potentially facilitating the political and ideological aspirations of individuals from other nations. The initial language of the French Revolution, a discourse explicitly framed in universalistic and cosmopolitan terms, provided the impetus for these conclusions as non-French radicals began engaging within the French capital's radical circles. While supporting the 1789 Revolution often called upon these émigré radicals to make political compromises, they still viewed events in Paris as marking the dawn of a transformative era in European and global politics, society, and culture.

However, the Great Revolution proved only a point of departure in a process of evolution in terms of foreign engagement with the city and its radical discourse. Though

Paris's prospects of serving as a departure point for broad change initially seemed bright, the inability of revolutionary discourse to break away from the French national context undercut its internationalist potential. The intense nationalism and xenophobia of the Revolution's radical phase reinforced this reality and largely brought to an end Paris's first manifestation as Europe's revolutionary epicenter. Though dormant for several decades, Paris reemerged as Europe's best hope of spurring revolutionary change in following the Revolution of 1830. While attempts to push this revolution forward in the early 1830s floundered, Paris under the Orleanist regime became the gathering point for international radicals of all stripes. This produced an environment where intellectual and philosophical exchange began reasserting Paris's revolutionary potential, with the discourse around early socialism introducing a more explicitly transnational element than had previously existed.

The revolutionary wave that began in February 1848 marked a new era in Paris's development as Europe's revolutionary center. Fired by their experiences on the barricades, émigré radicals attempted to export the French capital's revolution by military means, launching expeditions to their respective homelands to spread its fire. However, these efforts served to discredit this model, as all of these expeditions met with disaster. Moreover, the failure to consolidate the revolution within Paris led to its ultimate defeat by reaction, depriving the international radical movement of its center of support and demonstrating the dangers of not securing the revolution before pressing for its spread. The experience of 1848 also constituted a moment of realignment with both Paris's and Europe's political structure, with the bourgeoisie, once a key constituency within radicals

efforts, falling away and more often than not lending its support to reaction. This, along with the deepening influence of socialism, served to shift radical discourse and frame Paris's revolution potential in a more explicitly transnational light. Though stymied in the 1850s, Paris once again emerged as a potential revolutionary center under the so-called "liberal" Second Empire of the 1860s. Moreover, this period saw the International's introduction into the city, producing a more concrete transnational discourse that, in the prelude to the siege and Commune, framed Paris's revolutionary potential in more explicitly internationalist terms than any previous moment since 1789. Thus, for the three non-French Communards examined in the following chapters, a new Parisian revolution in the form of the Commune, once consolidated, presented a genuine means to realize their respective aspirations.

Chapter Two

Walking the Ideological Tightrope: Leo Frankel, the Commune, and the *République Universelle*

"If we could bring about a radical change in the (French) social order, the Revolution of March 18th will become the most seminal of all revolutions that history has recorded to this day!"[1] So wrote a previously unknown Hungarian jeweler and goldsmith, Leo Frankel, three days after his election as a representative to the Paris Commune and only a day after his appointment as Commissioner of Labor and Exchange, which vested him with responsibility for the economic welfare of over 1.8 million souls. However, far from being an aberration, Frankel's position in the Paris Commune of 1871 is illustrative of the importance of the large body of ideological immigrants who offered their services (and lives) to Paris's short-lived and tragic experiment in radical democracy.

While the participation of non-French radicals built on the model established with the French Revolution and reinforced between 1830 and 1848, the Commune in many ways constitutes the apex of émigré radical participation. This chapter will begin addressing why the Commune marked such a turning point by first analyzing Leo Frankel's early political activities, which eventually led to his active participation in the Parisian radical community, with specific emphasis first on Frankel's political and ideological positions between 1867 and early 1871. It will then investigate how

[1]"Letter, Leo Frankel to Karl Marx, March 30, 1871," in *The Paris Commune of 1871: The View from the Left*, ed. Eugene Schulkind (New York: Grove, 1974), 117–18.

interaction and negotiations with both international and French Communards transformed those initial ideals and produced an understanding of revolution that was both transnational and rooted in Paris's radical realities. By examining these factors, this chapter will demonstrate how Frankel, initially driven by furthering the International's interests in Paris, came to embrace political and ideological compromise in order to facilitate the Commune's success, which he recognized as the best means of realizing the *République Universelle.*

Leo Frankel's internationalist career fittingly began in a spacious one-story house in the Altofen-Neustift suburb[2] of Budapest, second city of the vast multinational Habsburg Empire, on February 24, 1844. The fourth of six children and the youngest male, Frankel was born into the comfortable middle class existence provided by his father, Dr. Albert Frankel, a well-established Jewish physician of German origins.[3] Though possessing a respected bourgeois practice, Dr. Frankel also earned a reputation for his work among the poor of the Danube dockyards, frequently providing *pro bono* care. An ardent Liberal, he vigorously supported the 1848 Hungarian Revolution and, according to his son, continued after its suppression to keep a silk portrait of Lajos Kossuth close to his heart.[4] In the years following the Revolution, he actively encouraged Leo and his other sons to read the subversive works of Heinrich Heine[5] and Friedrich Schiller available in the vast library inherited from their grandfather. While Dr.

---

[2]Known as Óbuda in Magyar, this district was added to Budapest in 1873 and now forms part of District III-Óbuda-Békásmegyer.
[3]Leo Frankel Dossier BB24 862, *Archives Nationales*
[4]Association des Amis de la Commune de Paris, 1871, *Leo Frankel: "le premier Ministre du travail du premier gouvernement ouvrier"* (Paris: Association des Amis de la Commune, 1996), 2.
[5]Heine himself spent a substantial period as a radical émigré within Paris during the 1830s and 1840s. See Chapter 1.

Frankel's middle class liberalism differed markedly from the radicalism his son later embraced, the experience of spending his earliest youth exposed to his father's revolutionary idealism profoundly influenced Leo Frankel's subsequent worldview.[6]

Family politics marked just one of the formative experiences of Leo Frankel's youth; his father's choice for his son's vocation also played a significant role in shaping young Leo's later radicalism. Driven in part perhaps by his political beliefs, Dr. Frankel chose skilled professions for his four sons rather than more conventional bourgeois career paths. His three older brothers were apprenticed as a mechanic, one a joiner, and the third a painter. Leo, though weak and sickly in comparison to his older brothers, demonstrated from an early age a remarkable capacity to undertake delicate work with his hands. Recognizing this skill, Frankel's parents apprenticed him as a goldsmith, the same profession as his maternal grandfather. It was their hope that he would someday take over his grandfather's shop in Vienna. While the young Frankel displayed a remarkable aptitude for the work during his years as an apprentice in Prague, he bristled under the exploitative labor system that existed in the workshop. Finishing his apprenticeship in the early 1860s, Frankel began his travels as a journeyman across the German lands of Central Europe. However, this road soon diverged markedly from the path of middle class respectability hoped for by his parents.[7]

---

[6]Beyond inspiring Frankel's general internationalist activism, the influence of his father's support of the 1848/49 Revolution asserted itself in his later political actions in Hungary itself. Following the defeat of the Commune, Frankel returned to Hungary and worked extensively with Mihaly Tancsics, the great worker's hero of 1848, during efforts to organize Hungarian Social Democrats in the early 1870s. See Alice Freifeld, *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848–1914* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2000), 239.

[7]Interestingly, of his three brothers, two did indeed follow the path of respectability to economic success. His brother Lajos immigrated to the United States and became a factory owner while his other brother

As Frankel crossed the German countryside, he encountered a region very much in transition. With the failure of the 1848 revolution and the subsequent repression over a decade in the past, the long dormant spirit of political activism ignited during the *Vormärz* once again began to assert itself. However, economic change and industrialization (albeit uneven at this point) prompted new political associations in which the working class, rather than the liberal bourgeoisie, took the lead. While most of the German workers' associations active during this period focused exclusively on workplace issues, by 1863 a new politically active workers' movement was crystallizing around the figure of Ferdinand Lassalle. A veteran revolutionary and uncompromising advocate of working class democracy, Lassalle promoted an open break with German liberals and the creation of an explicitly working class party, empowered by universal manhood suffrage and aimed at utilizing state power to acquire for the workers "an amount of education, power and freedom which would have been wholly unattainable by them as individuals."[8] With this program as a basis, Lassalle founded the *Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein* (ADAV), the first explicitly working class political party in German history. While still a mainly regional party centered in the more industrialized north at the time of Lassalle's death in August 1864, the ADAV began to grow steadily in the ensuing years, drawing in radicals and workers discontented with the liberal, bourgeois approach to political and economic reform.[9]

Ingomar enjoyed decades of success in Paris as a portrait painter. However, his third brother Jozsef joined Leo in radical activism during the 1870s and 1880s in Austria and his native Hungary.

[8]Ferdinand Lassalle, *Der Arbeiter-Programm* (London: The Modern Press, 1884), 49.

[9]Hermann Beck, "Working-Class Politics at the Crossroads of Conservatism, Liberalism and Socialism," in *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990.*, ed. David Barclay and Eric Weitz, 68–72 (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998).

Though sources are fragmentary, sometime during his travels in 1864 or early 1865, Leo Frankel became an active member of the growing Lassallist movement, the first of his many forays into transnational European radicalism. This political conversion is indicated by a poem submitted in 1865 in praise of Napoleonic era poet Theodor Körner when Frankel was a member of a Lassallist working-class education association in Munich. In general, Frankel appears to have lived a rather transient lifestyle during his journeyman period, and it is not until his appointment as the Paris correspondent for the *Sozialdemokraten*, a Lassallist journal published in Switzerland, that he adopted a more sedentary existence. In addition to becoming a working class activist during this period, Frankel also served for a brief time in the Prussian army and attained Prussian citizenship.[10] According to tradition, during his military service Frankel was stationed at the fortress of Königschwarts, which at the time held the prominent Leftist politician Johann Jacoby as well as the future father of the Social Democratic Party, August Bebel. Fellow socialists later asserted that Frankel, through his discussions with these two prisoners, had been radicalized; however, no proof exists to support such a meeting and it seems more likely to have been an invention of colleagues attempting to enhance Frankel's reputation during his political work in the Habsburg lands during the 1870s and 1880s.[11]

These efforts to tie Frankel to Jacoby and particularly to Bebel also likely stemmed from a conscious effort during his later work for the International to mask Frankel's earliest documented radical political affiliations. Based on his work for the

[10]Amis de la Commune, *Le Premier Ministre du Travail*, 3. His Prussian citizenship is further confirmed in his own words in a letter to Marx on April 25, 1871.
[11]Magda Aranyossi, *Leo Frankel* (Berlin, Dietz, 1957), 10 and Amis, 4.

Sozialdemokraten and his own writings, Frankel began his radical career as a fierce supporter of Jean Baptist von Schweitzer, Lassalle's *de facto* successor as leader of the ADAV and an intense political rival of August Bebel and his collaborator Wilhelm Liebknecht for the ideological leadership of the German working class movement. Schweitzer, editor of the *Sozialdemokraten* prior to Lassalle's death, continued to promote a program that included collaboration with the Prussian state in the interest of promoting working class goals, particularly universal male suffrage. Bebel and Liebknecht, radical members of the ADAV's main political rival, the *Verband Deutscher Arbeiter-Vereine* (VDAV), opposed the closeness between Schweitzer and the Prussian government, particularly its Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, and instead advocated internationalist principles promoted by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels through the International Workingmen's Association.[12] These debates became more vehement in 1867 as these men competed for influence in the newly formed General Association of German Workers, with both parties claiming to represent "true" socialism and to enjoy the supported of Marx, Engels, and the International. For their part, Marx and Engels, both of whom enjoyed a close friendship with Liebknecht, supported the VDAV faction and strongly condemned the dictatorial pretensions of Schweitzer and his continued support of Lassallism in general.[13]

As these disagreements intensified, Frankel became an active participant in these debates as a correspondent for Schweitzer's *Sozialdemokraten*. In a piece entitled "Ein

---

[12]Beck, 74–79.

[13]See "Letter, Frederick Engels to Karl Marx, September 24, 1868," and "Letter, Karl Marx to Johann Baptist von Schweitzer (Draft), October 13, 1868," in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works: Volume 43, Marx and Engels 1868–1870* (New York: International Publishers, 1988), 110, 132–33 for two examples of their sentiments toward Schweitzer and the debates among German socialists.

Offenes Wort an Herrn W. Liebknecht," Frankel begins by praising Schweitzer's ideological conceptions and devotion to carrying out the goals for the German working class first advocated by Lassalle. He then follows this mild introduction with a stinging attack on Liebknecht based on a speech given at a workers' meeting in Vienna, which he argues demonstrates Liebknecht's bourgeois-liberal inclinations and his lack of dedication to the cause of socialism.[14] As late as April 1870, despite subsequent developments in Frankel's relationship with the International and its leadership, Marx still referred to him as Schweitzer's man in Paris.[15] While Frankel's positions via Liebknecht and other future leaders of the German Social Democrats have greater bearing on his post-Commune political career than his actions during the Paris Commune, his participation in these debates have four important consequences. First, they provided the young Frankel with experience in the rough and tumble nature of political debate, particularly among feuding factions within the European socialist movement. Second, his early work provided him with the necessary radical credentials to participate in Communal politics, as well as providing experience operating within a foreign political context. Third, his work for the *Sozialdemokraten* brought him to the personal attention of Marx and Engels, with whom he would soon develop a working relationship. Finally, and most importantly, his work as a correspondent for Schweitzer led to his posting in Paris sometime in mid-1867, where he soon immersed himself in the radical politics of the city.

---

[14]Leo Frankel, "Ein offenes Wort an Hern W. Liebknecht," in *Sozialdemokraten,* No. 105, September 5, 1869.

[15]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, April 14, 1870," *Collected Works 43*, 478–81.

Establishing himself at 37 Rue Saint-Sébastien in the 11th Arrondissment,[16] Frankel spent only a short time in Paris before Liebknecht, attempting to draw Frankel away from Lassallism, encouraged him to visit Marx and Engels in London.[17] While no accounts survive of their initial encounters, which likely involved several trips to London between mid-1867 and early 1868, the effect on Leo Frankel was profound, transforming him into an ardent supporter of the International and an enthusiastic student of Marx's theories, as well as a personal friend.[18] Evidence of this interaction appears in later letters between Marx and Engels praising Frankel's capacity to understand Marx's theories regarding the calculation of labor's value, prompting Engels to quip that Frankel understands "*la formula* (Marx's theory) in Paris and delivers good wares."[19] Further evidence of intimacy comes from the pet names used by both Marx and Engels for Frankel in several letters: "Frankelche;" "a real yiddisher lad;" and, albeit not quite as tasteful, "our little Jew." Frankel also appears to have developed a relationship with Marx's daughter Jenny, demonstrated by his knowledge of her political writings published under a pseudonym and considered a "literary secret" among Marx's inner circle.[20]

---

[16]Leo Frankel Dossier, BB24 862, *Archives Nationales.*
[17]Aranyossi, 14.
[18]Jacques Rougerie, *Paris Libre*. (Seuil: Paris, 1971) 120; Martin Johnson, *Paradise of Association: Political Culture and Popular Organizations in the Paris Commune of 1871* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996) 70; and Roger Williams, *The French Revolution of 187--71* (New York: Norton, 1969), 133 all refer to Frankel's ideological position as strongly "Marxist" by the beginning of the Prussian Siege due to the relationship established during this period.
[19]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, April 14, 1870" and "Letter, Frederick Engels to Karl Marx, April 15, 1870," *Collected Works 43,* 478–83.
[20]"Letter, Paul Lafargue to Karl Marx, April 18, 1870," ibid, 485. The "literary secret" refers to as series of articles written by Jenny Marx under the name of J. Williams on the Irish Question.

While these letters lend credence to Frankel's political "conversion," his subsequent work in both Paris and other French cities for the International demonstrates his devotion to furthering its ideological mission, as well as his deepening engagement with the Continent's transnational radical discourse. By the late 1860s the French Section of the International badly needed an infusion of new blood as it faced growing government repression. For the first half of the decade, the International had enjoyed the tacit toleration of the Second Empire, demonstrated by its willingness to allow a workers' delegation to attend the 1862 London Exhibition, which led to French participation in the founding of the International itself in 1864. The official French Section came into being on January 8, 1865, and established a small office at 44, Rue des Gravilliers in Paris with the Second Empire's consent. This new branch, still dominated by supporters of Proudhon's mutualism, occasionally cooperated openly with the government, even utilizing Prince Jerome's personal newspaper to publish a manifesto urging the election of workers to parliament.[21] Taking advantage of the Second Empire's new liberalism, the International in France underwent a rapid expansion, so that by the end of 1867 it numbered nearly 40,000 members in Paris and 200,000 in the country overall. However, this expansion bred new confidence and led to the emergence of a younger generation of activists eager to end cooperation with Louis Napoleon's government and adopt a more confrontational manner. Members of the International played an integral role in the 1867 strike held by Parisian bronze workers, an ultimately successful effort that led to a raise

[21]Robert Tombs, *The Paris Commune* (New York: Longman, 1999), 32.

in their wages and the right to establish a Mutual Credit Society.[22] However, this triumph drew the ire of Louis Napoleon's government and led to an enhanced effort by the police to stifle the International in France.

Despite this growing threat of government repression, Frankel immediately took up the International's cause upon his return from London. In early 1868, Frankel travelled to Lyon to aid Albert Richard in founding and organizing a section of the International among the city's workers.[23] Following this successful foray, he returned to Paris and began making connections with prominent members of the French Branch within the city. This soon led to an active and successful collaboration with Eugène Varlin, a bookbinder, and one of the founders of the Paris section of the International. Described by a fellow Internationalist as possessing "a talent for organization and an influence that cannot be overestimated,"[24] Varlin quickly utilized Frankel to begin organizing the non-French workers within Paris who flooded the city during the 1850s and 1860s to work in Baron Haussmann's massive reconstruction efforts. Benoît Malon, another founding member of the Paris Branch, also became an active associate at this time, forging a partnership that would continue during their subsequent work on the Commune's economic policies. Paul Lafargue, also a devoted follower of Marx's theories as well as his son-in-law, also became a fellow traveler with Frankel during their work for the International in Paris.[25] Other Parisian radical luminaries, such as the

---

[22]William Serman, *La Commune de Paris* (Paris; Fayard, 1986), 60 and Stuart Edwards, *The Paris Commune, 1871* (New York; Quadrangle, 1971), 16.
[23]Jacques Rougerie, "La Première Internationale a Lyon (1865–1870)," in *Anali: Ann (ANNO?) Quarto 1961* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1962), 126–93.
[24]"Letter, Paul Lafargue to Karl Marx, April 18, 1870," *Collected Works 43,* 485.
[25]Ibid.

Blanquist Emile Duval and the Proudhonist Henri Tolain, became comrades-in-arms as well.[26] In short, Frankel's internationalist mission immersed him in Paris's vibrant, diverse, and highly active radical community. Moreover, it engaged him in a discourse that drew together different national and ideological conceptions of radicalism, producing a truly "entangled" transnational discourse within Paris.[27]

The ideological diversity of Frankel's Parisian Internationalist comrades merits further mention. While Frankel, along with Lafargue, worked ardently to promote Marx's political program within the International's French Branch, they, unlike their mentor in London, proved much more tolerant of doctrinal divisions within the movement. Though the dominance of Proudhonist ideas was waning to a degree among French Internationalists, it still constituted the dominant ideological bent. Henri Tolain, one of the French Branch's founders, still promoted labor mutualism, as did others. This unsurprisingly brought Tolain into open conflict with the always combative Marx, as well as Engels and other supporters during the 1868 Brussels's Conference, culminating with Marx pressing for Tolain's expulsion from the International.[28] Marx and Engels also distrusted Malon, a harbinger of much more serious confrontations after the Commune's repression. Even Varlin, though considered one "of our people" by Marx, clashed with the London leadership over questions of the organization of the French Branch, leading Marx at moments of frustration to declare the Parisian Internationalists "ragamuffins" and disavow any connection to them.[29] Despite these clashes between his ideological

---

[26]Aranyossi, 15.
[27]This draws upon the concept of "histoire croisée" discussed in the Introduction, see 12–13.
[28]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, September 16, 1868," *Collected Works 43,* 100.
[29]"Letter, Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, December 8, 1868," ibid, 176.

tutor and his French comrades, Frankel still collaborated easily with the diverse lot that constituted the French Branch, illustrating his growing connection to that radical community and his ability to navigate networks defined by conflicting ideologies, goals, and personalities.

Frankel's work with his fellow radicals constituted his overriding mission in Paris; however, to provide for his day to day existence, necessity required Frankel to find regular paying work outside of radical activism. In this, Frankel proved much more fortunate than some his comrades like Malon, whose activism left him blacklisted and forced to drift between menial jobs.[30] Frankel, as a skilled jeweler and goldsmith, soon found employment at an exclusive Parisian goldsmith firm that, ironically, set him immediately to work on intricate pieces commissioned by Empress Eugénie. For this skilled labor, Frankel earned between 30 and 40 francs a week for doing between three and four hours of work a day in his trade, thus freeing up substantial amounts of time for political agitation. His continued work for *Sozialdemokraten*, as well as occasional contributions to the German and Austrian radical journals *Volkswille* and *Volkstimme,* also further supplemented his income and, unlike his main vocation, allowed him to combine wage-earning with activism.

His financial security assured, Frankel focused most of his physical and mental energies on organizing for the International among the Parisian working class. His efforts quickly bore fruit, particularly his efforts among German workers, leading in mid-1869 to the official recognition of a German Section of the International's Parisian

[30]K. Steven Vincent, *Between Marxism and Anarchism: Benoit Malon and French Reformist Socialism* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1992), 18–19.

Branch.[31] Beyond his work with foreign workers, Frankel, in conjunction with Varlin and Malon, also engaged in organizational and educational efforts among French workers. Of particular significance, Frankel, Varlin, and Malon spearheaded efforts to spread the International's message among Paris's working women and promoted female participation in the organization's efforts, an approach vehemently opposed by Proudhonist French radicals. These efforts introduced Frankel to Nathalie Lemel and André Léo, both of whom became prominent feminist voices during the Commune.[32] By 1869, Lissagaray counted Frankel along with Varlin and Duval as the leading lights of the French movement.[33]

Unfortunately, just as Frankel's collaboration with Varlin began to bear fruit, Varlin was arrested in late 1869 in a police sweep of the International's members and imprisoned for organizing a mutual credit society among bookbinders and belonging to the International, a "secret society."[34] In reality, Varlin's activism during the May 1869 parliamentary elections led to his targeting by the Imperial police. During that campaign, Varlin and other leading French Internationalists issued an address "To the Voters in 1869," which demanded workers to elect only candidates that vowed to press for the standing army's abolition, a separation of church and state, and the nationalization of industry.[35] Unsurprisingly, the Bonaparte Regime took a rather dim view of such demands. Thus, Varlin's arrest, along with that of Malon and seven other leading

---

[31]Aranyossi, 18.
[32]Eichner, 43.
[33]Prosper-Olivier Lissagaray, *L'histoire de la commune de 1871* (Paris: Dentu, 1896), 10.
[34]Edwards, 211.

[35] Aux électeurs de 1869," quoted in Eugene Varlin, *Pratique militante Ecrits d'un ouvier communard* (Paris: Francois Maspero, 1977), 68–70.

Parisian Internationalists illustrated the growing unease within the Imperial government with the French working class's increasingly vocal demands for labor and social reform.[36] Louis Napoleon's ministers and secret policemen saw the International's red hand behind the wave of protests and strikes sweeping France as the decade waned. Thus, the Imperial Government, discarding its liberal veneer, reversed an earlier tolerant attitude toward the International and marked the organization for destruction.

In early 1870, Varlin and the other accused Internationalists were brought before the Imperial Court's Sixteenth Chamber and tried for their participation in a "prohibited organization." Prompted by the plight of his comrades, Frankel responded with a vigorous organizing effort to galvanize support among the city's workers. On February 24, Frankel, along with the Austrian Internationalist Henrik Bachruch, published a petition in *Égalité*, the International's French-Swiss newspaper, protesting against the "illegal arrest of the citizen Varlin" and asking for the sympathy and support of all socialists for this "courageous fighter."[37] While this plea aimed specifically at organizing protest among Paris's workers from the German lands, its tone and prominence in the French Branch's official organ indicates Frankel's growing prominence within the Parisian radical movement as well as his growing devotion to his fellow activists. Despite Frankel's earnest efforts, the trial's outcome was a foregone conclusion: Nine guilty verdicts were handed down and Varlin, Malon, and their fellows each received three months imprisonment as well as a 100 franc fine.[38]

---

[36]Edmond Villetard, *Histoire De L'Internationale* (Paris, Kessinger, 1872), 185.
[37]*Egalite*, February 24, 1870.
[38]Villetard, 186.

During Varlin's imprisonment, Frankel remained undeterred in his efforts to expand the International, particularly among Paris's foreign workers. After organizing German workers for Varlin's defense in February, Frankel scored a major victory in early April 1870 with the official establishment of a German Section of the International's Parisian Branch. In the journal *La Réforme Sociale* Frankel praised Paris's German workers for their choice, declaring that their participation in the International demonstrated an understanding that "the working class can only escape the arising moral and material slavery of capital by a fraternal organization of all workers." Interestingly, with most major Parisian radicals imprisoned, he also encouraged the new German Section to abide by the decisions of the International's General Congress in Basel, a clear nod toward Marx's ideological conceptions in the absence of his comrades' differing French perspectives.[39] At the same time, Frankel, along with Bachruch, also actively worked to organize the city's Hungarian workers, pledging that if they aided the International, "you will win the fight for social and political equality."[40]

This notable acceleration in Frankel's organizational work in early 1870 was not without cause, but rather a vital element in an overarching effort that proved both the apogee and the swansong of the International's French Branch's labors during the Second Empire. On April 18, 1870, between 1,200 and 1,300 French Internationalists gathered in Paris to found the Paris Federation of the International Workingmen's Association, a new body designed to unify the efforts of various International sections and branches throughout France. Varlin, mere weeks out of prison, accepted the chairmanship and

[39]*La Réforme Sociale*, April 3, 1870.
[40]Quoted in Aranyossi, 20.

immediately directed the new federation to concentrate its activism on opposing the newest plebiscite on reform being put forth by Louis Napoleon's regime, an order with repercussions that would be soon made apparent. To facilitate this centralizing effort, the delegates also debated and adopted a set of rules of federation. Both Frankel and Paul Lafargue strongly pushed the inclusion of language in the rules that called for stronger centralization within the new organization, as well as adherence to the motions passed in the recent Basel Congress.[41] Though opposed by the remaining Proudhonian Mutualists, Frankel and Lafargue, with the support of Varlin, managed to have this language included.[42] Following this founding assembly, the Federation established a permanent headquarters at the Place de la Corderie du Temple and began its efforts at coordinating the International's French efforts.[43] While the creation of the Paris Federation represented a singular triumph for Frankel and his Internationalist comrades, their celebration proved to be short-lived.

As Frankel's and his fellow Internationalists" efforts peaked in early 1870, the hold of Louis Napoleon over the country was rapidly crumbling, prompting a new series of reforms aimed at reconstituting the government as a "Liberal Empire." First proposed in 1869, the government organized a plebiscite, set for May 8, 1870, to give approval to this new constitution. The French Internationalists opposed this plebiscite and called on French workers to abstain from voting. The Internationalists, like the entire range of opponents of the Second Empire, smelled blood in the water and thus devoted themselves

[41]Which strengthened the leadership role of Marx and the London Council in the International as a whole.
[42]"Letter, Paul Lafargue to Karl Marx, April 18, 1870," *Collected Works 43*, 486.
[43]Lissagaray, 10.

to taking obstructionist stances at every possible point.[44] However, while the Empire's legitimacy was unquestionably deteriorating, this breakdown did not extend to its police forces. In late April, the Prime Minister Emile Olivier ordered the Justice Ministry to crack down on the International's leaders prior to the plebiscite, using a series of bomb scares engineered by lone-wolf extremists as cause. Anticipating the Regime's actions, Frankel, along with thirty other Federal Council members, issued a statement on May 2 denouncing the Empire's effort to tie these "bomb outrages" to the International and definitely declaring that the International "will exist in spite of all the powerless prosecutions against its… [leaders], as long as all the speculators, capitalists, priests and political adventurers shall not have disappeared."[45] Within days, Frankel and nearly every prominent Internationalist leader in Paris were arrested and charged with conspiracy and membership in a secret society.

Brought before the Supreme Court of Justice at Blois in late June, Frankel and eighteen other defendants first challenged the validity of the charges, contending that neither the membership nor the meetings of the International were held in secret; hence it could not be considered a secret society. However, once it became readily apparent that, regardless of legal realities, the outcome of the trial was a foregone conclusion, Frankel and his comrades used the court as a soapbox to attack the regime in the Press, which, granted greater freedoms under the Liberal Empire, reported verbatim the minutes of each session. Frankel garnered significant fanfare for his performance, which ranged between attacks on the legality of the charges to discourses on the origins of economic

[44]Edwards, 23.
[45]Quoted in Villetard, 209.

inequality as highlighted by Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot. Utilizing both notable rhetorical flourish and transparent grandstanding, Frankel ended his defense with the following crescendo:

> The International is a tree whose roots reach deeply into the earth of all lands… and it is exceptionally naïve to believe that one can extinguish the life swimming under the bark by cutting off one branch or another. To all who do not understand the voice of time and believe that the Socialist movement can be stopped, I cry as once did Galileo, "Eppur si Muove!"[46]

Reading these accounts, Engels reported back to Marx that "our little Jew Frankel has won laurels," and, indeed, his performance before the High Court greatly enhanced his reputation among Parisian radicals. Nevertheless, it did nothing to mitigate the trial's outcome and in early July Frankel was condemned, along with dozens of others, to one year imprisonment and a hundred franc fine.[47]

Following the guilty verdict, Frankel and his fellows found themselves at St. Pelagie, Paris's main prison for political prisoners. Interestingly, as Alistair Horne relates, St. Pelagie lacked the harsh conditions usually associated with political prisons, particularly those familiar from twentieth-century manifestations.[48] As a result of the lax nature of the compound, Frankel spent much of his incarceration "networking" with other radicals. In particular, he spent much time conversing with Jules Vallès, a radical republican journalist/author well known in Parisian leftist circles for his long-standing opposition to the Second Empire who later became the editor of the highly influential *Cri du Peuple* during the Commune.[49] However, the acquisition of new political

---

[46]Excerpt from the "Third International Trial" in *Réveil*, July 7, 1870.
[47]Villetard, 213.
[48]Alistair Horne, *The Fall of Paris: The Siege and the Commune 1870–1* (London: MacMillan, 1965), 270.
[49]Aranyossi, 27.

acquaintances provided small comfort to Frankel and his comrades, whose painstaking organizational efforts proved for naught in the face of the Second Empire's wave of arrests and trials. By the summer of 1870, the French Branch of the International ceased to exist as a viable political organization just as France began to undergo one of the most disastrous and politically unstable periods since the Great Revolution of 1789.

While Frankel and his comrades languished, their great nemesis, the Empire of Louis Napoleon, met its less than glorious end at Sedan. When word reached Paris on September 4, three days after the Emperor's surrender, the last vestiges of the shabby Bonapartist regime were swept away by a popular tide, which poured toward the Hôtel de Ville to proclaim a Republic. That same day, Frankel and his fellow radicals were freed from St. Pelagie by armed workers from Paris's proletarian districts, only to discover a city in turmoil as elation over the republic's proclamation mixed with hysteria over the pending Prussian investment of the city. However, any elation they themselves felt about a new republic's promise was quelled later that day when word spread that Paris would be governed by a quasi-military Provisional Government of National Defense for the duration of the Prussian threat. Lissagaray later wrote that Parisian Internationalists felt that "all Paris abandoned itself to the men of the Hôtel de Ville," who were able to prey on the Parisian masses' fears of the Prussians to declare themselves "legitimate by popular acclamation."[50] In ensuing days, prominent non-Internationalist figures on the French Left, such as Blanqui, Louis Blanc, and Victor Hugo, joined the initial chorus

[50]Lissagaray, 13.

calling on all Parisians to unite behind the Provisional Government in defiance of the Prussians.[51]

Despite any resentment the Parisian Internationalists may have felt at this "capitulation" to the "reactionary" Provisional Government, they wasted little time in organizing a response, holding a mass meeting on the evening of September 4 at their old headquarters at Place de la Corderie du Temple that drew a large and diverse crowd described by one participant as strongly "revolutionary socialist" in nature. After some debate, this meeting agreed to send delegates to the Provisional Government demanding municipal elections, the abolition of the police, and the arming of the Parisian populace, all of which the Provisional authorities rejected in short order. Two days later, Frankel, at the request of the General Council, authored an appeal "To the Social Democratic people of Germany," which called on proletarians fighting with the Prussian Army to throw down their weapons and join with their French comrades in the struggle against the bourgeoisie.[52] However, despite such grandiose pronouncements, the combination of war, repression, and the siege had greatly crippled the French Section of the International. While the Parisian Internationalists chaired the September 4 meeting, labor federation members, diverse activists, and neighborhood association leaders all played an active role in debating and shaping policy. Some Internationalists balked at this decentralization of power and argued the French Section should assert its leadership over the growing Leftist opposition to the Provisional Government.[53] Recognizing the French Section's situation better than its rank and file members, Varlin, Frankel, Malon, and other members of the

[51]Edwards, 66.
[52]Aranyossi, 30.
[53]Gustave Lefrancais, *Etude sur la movement Communaliste a Paris en 1871* (Paris: Edhis, 1968), 90–91.

leadership accepted that current political realities required members of the International to compromise their long-term goals in favor of cooperation with the larger Left opposition within Paris.[54]

The diverse nature of the Parisian Left's response to the Provisional Government manifested itself in the weeks following September 4. Prompted by a call issued during the September 4 meeting at La Corderie and subsequently published in *La Réveil*, Left opposition activists within each *arrondissement* began organizing so-called "committees of vigilance" in imitation of those formed during the Great Revolution in 1793. As these committees developed, the International played only a minor role in organizing these groups, usually limited to arranging a public meeting to vote on their leadership. While some *arrondissements* included prominent Internationalists in their leadership, such as Frankel in the 11th, and at least one, the 15th, had a vigilance committee completely dominated by the International, others were controlled by other Leftist groups. The working class stronghold of Belleville, for example (constituting the 19th and 20th *arrondissements*), was led almost exclusively by followers of Blanqui.[55] This provides conclusive evidence of both the weakness of the International during the siege and its adherence to subordinating its overall principles to the common cause of the Parisian Left opposition, with its willingness to cooperate with the oft-criticized Blanquists providing compelling proof.

---

[54]The subordinate role played by the International during both the Siege and the Commune is still disputed by some scholars. See Johnson, 22, n. 19.

[55]Jacques Rougerie, "Quelques documents nouveau pour l'histoire du Comite Central Republicain des Vingt Arrondissements," *Le Mouvement Social* 37 (1961): 3–29.

Despite the factional diversity within these vigilance committees, the need for an overarching citywide organization rapidly became apparent. Frankel, as well as the other elected leaders from each *arrrondissement*'s committee, began to hold general meetings at the Internationalists' headquarters at La Corderie as early as September 9. By September 13, the individual vigilance committees had developed a citywide executive council, styled *Le Comité Central Républicain du Défense National des Vingt arrondissements de Paris* (the Republican Central Committee of National Defense of the Twenty Arrondissements). Though later characterized by the Commune's repressors as an Internationalist front, in reality the Central Committee represented a wide range of views and was particularly influenced, according to Frankel's comrade Malon, by delegates drawn from the political clubs that had formed in the last years of the Empire. These representatives drew heavily from the "violent language of the popular assemblies," which in turn drew inspiration from the radical nationalism of the Great Revolution's Jacobins.[56] This neo-Jacobin sentiment is easily discerned in the first proclamation issued by the Central Committee on September 15. Though certain elements in the proclamation reflect general Leftist principles shared by the Internationalists, other statements, particularly those calling for action in the name of "the safety of the Nation and the Republic" clearly echo the chauvinism of 1793, which obviously contradicted the International's core principles. Further, the proclamation's blatant attempts to replicate certain policies from 1793 (expanding the National Guard via a *levée en masse*, the reintroduction of maximums, etc.) demonstrated an anachronistic

[56]Benoît Malon, *La Troisième défaite du prolétariat Français* (Paris: Éditions d'histoire sociale, 1968), 41.

tendency among some French Leftists denounced as far back as Marx's 1852 *Eighteenth Brumaire*.[57]

Clearly the willingness of Frankel and other Internationalists to associate themselves with these chauvinistic anachronisms can be credited in part to organizational weakness; however, other factors were also in play. While not a majority within the Central Committee, nearly every prominent member of the French International, including Frankel, Varlin, Malon, and Bachruch, represented their *arrondissements* on the Committee, thus placing them in a strong position to influence policy.[58] Lefrançais, writing thirty years later, contends that the International purposefully distanced itself from a leadership role, arguing that committing themselves in such a fluid and unstable situation would undermine their long-term social and economic goals.[59] However, more contemporary sources challenge this assertion. In a mid-September letter to a comrade in Brussels, Marx includes an excerpt from a letter sent by Auguste Serraillier, a long-standing member of the French Branch charged by the London General Council after September 4 to act as their agent in Paris. Reflecting on the French Branch's policies thus far, Serrailier's contemptuously reports, "it is unbelievable that for six years people can be Internationalists…no longer recognize anyone as a foreigner and arrive at the state they have now reached, simply to preserve a fictitious popularity…moreover, what a situation they are creating for the International by their ultra-chauvinist discourses!" He

[57]"First Proclamation by the Central Committee of the Twenty Arrondissements, 15 September, 1870," in *The Communards of Paris, 1871*, ed. Stewart Edwards (Ithica: Cornell UP, 1973), 44–46.
[58]According to Malon, Frankel, as well as Varlins, Lefrancais and himself signed the September 15 Proclamation, see Malon, 41.
[59]Lefrancais, *Etude*, 91 and *Souvenirs d'un Révolutionnaire* (Paris: Société encyclopédique française, 1972), 409.

follows by roundly condemning their abdication to the popular fervor, closing with the damning critique that "they can think of nothing better than to parody the revolution of '93."[60] This account, combined with the International's manifest weakness in Paris after two years of repression, paints a picture of a Parisian Internationalist leadership moving away from its long-standing ideological commitments toward positions driven by the realities of their political environment and their continuous interactions with non-International Parisian radicals. Leo Frankel, who had a close working relationship with Serraillier,[61] soon found even his ardent Internationalism challenged and swayed by the riptides sweeping through a Paris both besieged and brimming with internal discontent.

Frankel's growing involvement with the particularities of Parisian wartime politics was also further demonstrated by his military service. When the conflict with Prussia began in July, the city government, in order to man Paris's extensive fortifications, called to the colors most existing units of the capital's National Guard. Nearly all of these volunteer, unpaid units originated in Paris's more affluent *arrondissements* due to the Empire's latent (and understandable) hesitance to arm residents of the capital's working class neighborhoods. However, the revolution of September 4, coupled with the approaching Prussian army, led to a radical change in policy as Leon Gambetta, one of the Provisional Government's more radical leaders, called for a vast expansion of Paris's National Guard on September 6. Despite deep reservations on the part of the rest of the Provisional Government's leadership, the Guard expanded from 60 (overwhelmingly bourgeois) battalions to 138 within a week and

[60]"Letter, Karl Marx to Cesar De Paepe, 14 September, 1870," in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works: Volume 44, Marx and Engels 1870–1873* (New York: International, 1989), 79.
[61]See "Letter, Karl Marx to Leo Frankel, April 24, 1871," ibid, 141, and Aranyossi, 30–31.

nearly 194 by the end of September, most drawn from either mixed or working class neighborhoods. This armed mass, nearly 340,000 strong, provided the city's radical forces with a previously unimagined political weapon: an armed populace. The National Guard's expansion also further played into the opposition Left's hands due to the 1.5 franc per day allowance for service established on September 12. Given that the siege (which officially began on September 19) resulted in massive unemployment, particularly for those on the economic ladder's lowest rungs, daily military service became a virtual necessity for the city's poorer elements.[62] However, though the National Guard provided public works/welfare funding during the Siege, most working class and radical Parisians enlisted in the Guard primarily from a sense of patriotic duty coupled with the desire to be armed and thus capable of holding the Provisional Government accountable to the people.

Frankel, despite both his Internationalism and his Prussian citizenship, was also swept up in the popular call to defend Paris and enlisted in his neighborhood battalion of the National Guard. Soon after his joining the 66th Battalion, based in his own 11th *arrondissement*, Frankel found himself promoted to corporal and appointed to the battalion commander, Augustin Avrial, as a member of his staff.[63] Avrial, a worker and member of the International who would later represent the 11th *arrondissement* on the Communal Council,[64] viewed Frankel's previous service in the Prussian Army as an asset in training his amateur soldiers for battle. Like all National Guard members, Frankel

---

[62]For a discussion of the National Guard's origins and its expansion during the Siege, see Lissagaray, 3–4; Edwards, 46–48,;Tombs, 45–46; and Serman, 122.
[63]Amis de la Commune, *Le Premier Ministre du travail*, 4.
[64]See *Proces-Verbaux de la Commune de Paris: Edition Critique*, vol. 1, ed. Georges Bourgin and Gabriel Henriot (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1924), 21.

participated in twice daily drills, as well as serving stints guarding the ramparts or standing sentry duty at key points within the city.[65] Though these limited duties left Frankel ample time to continue his radical activism, this experience of military service unquestionably further exposed him to the neo-Jacobin sentiment fast spreading through the besieged city. Further, his time in the ranks likely fostered the development of new relationships within the Parisian radical population, particularly at the neighborhood level, thus introducing yet more influences on his political thinking.[66] Finally, his enlistment in the Parisian National Guard, an organization that viewed itself (in working class units) as both a protector of the nation and an instrument of revolution, assured his presence at any *journées* aimed at the increasingly unpopular Provisional Government.

Beyond serving with neighborhood level radicals in the National Guard's ranks, Frankel also further expanded his local interactions through participation in the club movement that developed during the Siege. As mentioned above, these clubs, though inspired by the Great Revolution's Jacobins and Cordeliers, appeared during the "Liberal" Empire's last years. However, after September 4 these political clubs began to proliferate rapidly, often emerging in tandem with local vigilance committees. These clubs, meeting in dance halls and churches, provided lively grass-root forums on both grand political, social, and military issues as well as addressing local concerns (particularly related to food) arising during the Siege.[67] While the International as a body distanced itself from such organizations (with one notable exception), individual members, such as Frankel, actively participated in these public forums. According to one

[65]Horne, 94–95.
[66]The 66th Battalion, given its leadership and location, was likely a working class National Guard unit.
[67]Gustave de Molinari, *Les Club rouges pendant la Siege du Paris* (Paris: Garnier, 1871), 1–25.

source, Frankel most frequently spoke at *le Club de la Reine-Blanche* in Montmartre, earning repeated standing ovations for his fierce rhetoric.[68] However, given the prominence of Théophile Ferré and other leading Blanquists in that club, as with most of the 18th *arrrondissement's* radical organizations, such a prominent role for Frankel seems unlikely. The Internationalist-dominated *Club de l'Ecole de Médecine*, in the 6th *arrondissement*, served rather as the most frequented platform for Frankel and other International leaders to participate in the club culture. Frankel, after attending for months and observing this organization, served on a committee charged with considering providing this club's newspaper, *Lutte à outrance*, with official recognition as an Internationalist organ.[69] While Paris's capitulation eventually tabled this discussion, Frankel's willingness to endorse this club despite the International's coolness toward such "anachronistic" organizations denotes a level of identification with the diverse street corner activism of the clubs.

Leo Frankel's participation in multiple Parisian radical associations as the Siege progressed contrasts markedly with his inaction as an International member. Frankel's behavior mirrors that of his Internationalist comrades in this regard and seems to be symptomatic of a continuation of the French Branch's malaise noted in September. On October 5, an appeal by the Central Committee appeared in Leftist newspapers. This call, reflecting growing radical discontent over the Provisional Government's failure to hold municipal elections and its conduct of the war, once again heavily utilized neo-Jacobin language in its demands. The document contends that rapid elections would

---

[68]Amis de la Commune, *Le Premier Ministre du travail*, 4.

[69]"Procès-verbal du séance du 5 Janvier 1871," in *Les séances officielles de l'Internationale à Paris / pendant le siége et pendant la Commune* (Paris: Lachuard, 1872), 10–12.

allow "the people of Paris to assume the leadership in this supreme effort to deliver Paris from the foreign invader and...protect the Republic from reactionary forces."[70] As was the case with the September 15 Proclamation, Frankel signed this document, along with Varlin, Malon, Lefrançais, and nearly every other major Internationalist figure. Though operating in their Central Committee capacity, Frankel and his comrades once again approved a political statement utilizing the neo-Jacobin language of anachronistic patriotism that they found ideologically problematic.

The day after this appeal appeared, the Central Committee, prompted by Lefrancais's suggestion, voted to organize a demonstration at l'Hôtel de Ville for October 8. Though ultimately a failure, with bourgeois National Guardsmen dispersing the crowd, the actions of the Internationalist during this event are telling. Serraillier, in his report to the International's General Council in London, reported that during this demonstration "all our members (including Frankel) were present but only as individuals, not an association; there was no concerted action, they did nothing."[71] This failed demonstration established a pattern of behavior by the International leadership that reasserted itself during the events of October 31. On the previous day, word spread throughout Paris that the stronghold of Metz, containing France's last remaining professional army, had surrendered to its Prussian besiegers. This news coincided with word that Adolphe Thiers had opened armistice negotiations with Bismarck on the

[70]"Appeal to the Paris Population by the Central Committee of the Twenty Arrondissements to hold elections," *Le Combat*, October 5, 1870.
[71]*Documents of the First International: The General Council of the First International 1864-72, Minutes* (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1962), 140.

Provisional Government's behalf.[72] In response, radicals of all stripes converged on the morning of October 31 at la Corderie to formulate a response. The Central Committee decided to send a delegation, led by Lefrançais, to the l'Hôtel de Ville to demand immediate elections to replace the inept Provisional Government. Despite some initial success, the untimely intervention of the Leftist adventurer Gustave Flourens and the aged Blanqui caused the effort to degenerate into chaos and allowed the Provisional Government to marshal a successful response. By early the next morning, all of the revolutionaries had been bloodlessly expelled from the l'Hôtel de Ville by pro-government National Guard units. Though ultimately a failure, the events of October 31 proved a watershed, further galvanizing Parisian radicals against the Provisional Government and thus providing the impetus for the eventual Revolution of March 18.[73]

During this critical juncture, Frankel, along with Varlin, Malon, and other top International leaders, glaringly failed to show any unity of purpose and once again acted as individuals rather than as an organization. As noted above, Lefrançais played a leading role in events, as did Frankel's National Guard Commander Avrial; however, both acted in their capacity as Central Committee members rather than as Internationalists. Serraillier's account relates that he urged the International's Federal Council to meet on the morning of October 31 "to take some steps for the...demonstration" only to be met with the reply from Varlin, Frankel, and others that "the International could not act politically as an *association*." While it appears likely that

[72]Lissagaray, 20–21.
[73]For an account of the events of October 31, see Louise Michel, *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel*, ed. and trans. Bullitt Lowry and Elisabeth Gunter (Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1981), 60, and Lissagaray 22–24; Malon, 44–46; and Lefrancais, *Etude*, 92–104

Frankel and his comrades joined the march against the Provisional Government, they did so as free political agents operating within a larger Parisian radical community. The fact that no major Internationalist (aside from Lefrançais) found themselves arrested in the Provisional Government's roundup in the days following October 31 gives further credence to both the International and its individual members' limited role. In contrast, twenty-one other left-wing leaders, mostly Blanquists, were swept up in the police net, while the venerable jailbird himself, along with Gustave Flourens, eluded the authorities only to find themselves condemned to death *in absentia*.[74] Though the French International's avoidance of political action preserved its distance from Blanqui's conspiratorial vanguardism, in the case of the October 31 *journée* this fig leaf fails to cover the profound weakness and indecisiveness displayed by Frankel, Varlin, and the International leaders in the face of rapidly moving events. The consequence of this inaction by Frankel and the International would, when they revealed themselves, prompt a serious reassessment of ideology vis-à-vis hard political realities.

Following the failure of the October 31 insurrection, the Provisional Government decided to take full advantage of the momentum provided by its opponents' shortcomings and called for elections beginning on November 3. These elections were to be limited in scope, consisting of a plebiscite on the Provisional Government as well as mayoral elections for the 20 *arrondissements*, a far cry from the general election demanded by the radicals during their *journée*. The plebiscite proved an unmitigated disaster for the International and the entire Parisian Left. In the final tally, the Provisional Government enjoyed an overwhelming *oui* vote by a margin of 221,374 to 53,585. Even more

[74]Edwards, 84–85.

troubling for the Left was the support for the Provisional Government apparent among those in uniform, with 236,623 *oui* to only 9,053 *non.*[75] The mayoral elections proved almost as disastrous, with radicals becoming mayors in only two *arrondissements* (the 19th and the 20th*)* and assistant mayors in a further nine. Tellingly, only two prominent Internationalists won posts, with both Malon and Lefrançais serving as assistant mayors in the 17th and 20th *arrondissements* respectively.[76] Frankel, given his status as a foreigner, did not stand in this election; however, Varlin's name appeared on a number of lists but failed to garner enough votes. Without question, these early November elections represented a massive defeat not just for the International but for the Parisian radicals overall. The Republican Central Committee ceased (temporarily) to be the center of radical organization within the city, as many *arrondissements* stopped sending representatives to its meetings.[77] This defeat represented the nadir for the French Left during the siege, as Jacques Rougerie relates, "the revolutionary organizations became inactive, popular meetings languished, everywhere the October 31 fiasco was cruelly felt."[78] Clearly, Frankel and his comrades needed to reformulate their approach, not only as a means to contribute to the struggle with both the Provisional Government and the Prussians, but also as a way to remain a relevant force within the Parisian radical movement.

---

[75]Tombs, 49.
[76]Jean Dautry and Lucien Scheler, *Le Comité Central Républicain des vingt arrondissements de Paris (septembre 1870-mai 1871)* (Paris: Editions Sociales, 1960), 126–27. Stuart Edwards also notes that by December, Malon, with the aid of Varlin, was able to wrest effective control of the 17th *arrondisement* from its elderly mayor, placing at least one neighborhood firmly in the hands of the Internationalists, see Edwards, 86–87.
[77]Robert Wolfe, *The Origins of the Paris Commune. The Popular Organizations of 1868–1871* (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1966), 324, and Johnson, 30-21. CHECK PAGES
[78]Rougerie, *Paris Libre*, 59.

In the short term following October 31, the perceived failures of Frankel, Varlin, Malon, and the other leaders led to a fracture among the Internationalists in the city. Serraillier, disgusted by the old guard's inaction, organized a new Federal Council that drew on the more revolutionary members of Paris's neighborhood sections (Serraillier's group reconciled with the Federal Council and returned to its ranks only in late January 1871, following Paris's capitulation). The original Federal Council's control over neighborhood sections greatly diminished in general following the October 31 debacle, with many of these groups acting independently while claiming to speak for the entire French Branch.[79] This challenge drove Frankel and the other core leaders to take action, leading to the drafting of a new "Declaration of the International" in late November.

This document clearly aimed at restoring the Internationalists' lost prestige by presenting a coherent and comprehensive strategy addressing both the pressing issues brought on by the Siege and their long term approach to overseeing the foundation of the "Social Republic." According to Rougerie, a small group including Frankel drafted this document after weeks of spirited debate among the Internationalist leadership.[80] This Declaration represented a major departure from the French Branch's traditional strategy, including for the first time a clear *political* program, which had been consciously avoided in the past, as well as calls for economic and social reforms. Moreover, this political program focuses extensively on the issue of municipal autonomy and freedom, a clear reference to the political model of the 1792 Paris Commune. In addition to immediate elections for a municipal council, the document closes by stating, in addition to demands

[79]*Documents of the First International*, 141, n. 512.
[80]Rougerie, *"Mouvement Ouvrier a Paris,"* 33–34.

for solidarity and worker control of the means of production, that "What we all want, it is that every village recuperates its local independence and governs itself within a free France."[81]

This emphasis on the municipal Commune demonstrates Frankel's and his comrades' growing pragmatism in the face of Parisian political realities. The Internationalists loyal to Marx, despite their best efforts, remained an ideological minority, greatly outnumbered particularly by those adhering to the Proudhonian model that emphasized local autonomy. In the aftermath of October 31, talk among the various strands of Parisian radicalism began to focus more and more on the recreation of the "revolutionary Commune" of the Great Revolution. This was made particularly apparent by the calls coming from growing club movement in Paris's working class districts, which asserted that the only viable solution to the failed Government of National Defense was a new revolutionary government directly controlled by the Parisian radical masses. Thus, Frankel and his fellow Internationalists, in order to preserve their radical relevance, willingly embraced this "revolutionary anachronistic" (at least in the view of many Internationalists) vision of city government.[82]

Also telling in this document is the balancing act Frankel and his colleagues attempt to strike between the International's universalistic principles and the intense patriotism that defined the Parisian radical response to both the siege and the Provisional Government's war effort (or lack thereof). At several points within the document, Frankel and the other drafters present the orthodox Internationalist view, emphasizing

[81]"Déclaration de l'Internationale," reproduced in full in Rougerie, *Paris Libre*, 54–58.
[82]For a discussion of the growing significance of the "revolutionary commune" in the later stages of the Siege, see Johnson, 33–35.

their role as "partisans of peace and the fraternity of all peoples" and their rejection of workers fighting workers in the interest of "monarchs" and "exploiters." However, the overall language utilized in the document is not that of International brotherhood but rather a fierce patriotism much more akin to the fiery rhetoric of 1792. The phrase "*guerre à outrance*" (war to the bitter end) appears throughout the Proclamation and indeed constitutes the fourth point in the International's plan of immediate action. The Proclamation begins with the phrase "At this time when the soil of France is invaded by the Prussians and their vassals," a clarion call more reminiscent of *La Marseillaise* than the International's ideological anti-nationalism.[83] Obviously pragmatism and the need to generate mass appeal were in play when Frankel and his fellow Internationalists penned their Proclamation. However, particularly for an Internationalist like Frankel whose own experiences emphasized a transnational understanding of radicalism, the willingness to indulge in this linguistic resurrection of the "spirit of '92" denotes the transformative effect the growing crisis in Paris was having on his ideological conceptions. As Rougerie states in assessing this Proclamation, "These Internationalists are not only inspired (or poisoned) by the "grand legacy" of the Year II…they began to seek to exceed it."[84]

Despite the grandiose nature of the November Declaration, radical activity in Paris for much of December focused on the local level, and clubs and the neighborhood sections of the International became the main venue for political activity. This process of decentralization can be credited in part to worsening conditions as besieged Paris began to feel both the tightening of the Prussian vice and the onset of winter. The writer

[83]"Déclaration de l'Internationale," 54–58.
[84]Rougerie, *"Mouvement Ouvrier a Paris,"* 35. It is quite clear that Rougerie's own Marxian conceptions are at play in his analysis here.

Edmond de Goncourt observed on December 8, "hunger begins and famine is on the horizon."[85] Horseflesh supplemented by the Parisian rat, became the primary source of protein for most citizens by mid-November. The quality of bread declined and heating fuel became nearly non-existent for average Parisians by Christmas. Only wine seemed to remain plentiful throughout this period of depredation.[86] Consequently, aside from Guardsmen manning the city defenses, many Parisians, particularly those with limited resources, restricted themselves primarily to their own quarter. Interestingly, Frankel, as well as Varlin and most of the other *grands militants* of the International, disappear from the record of radical doings until the beginning of January. In Frankel's case, his residency in the 11th *arrondissement*, a mixed-class neighborhood not known for particularly active political clubs, might account for his temporary absence from the radical political scene. However, residency alone does not account for the seemingly dominant role the International's neighborhood sections on the Left Bank played in radical doings for much of December, temporarily eclipsing the Federal Council. In particular, the Democratic and Socialist Club of the 13th *arrondissement*, made up of Internationalists with strong Blanquist ties, claimed during this period to speak for the International as a whole.[87]

This silence on Frankel's and the other Federal Council members' part in favor of these local militants took on greater significance on January 1, 1871, when a mass meeting of the city's various radical groups agreed to replace the Republican Central

---

[85]Edmond de Goncourt, *Paris under siege, 1870–1871: From the Goncourt Journal*, ed. George Becker (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), 142.
[86]Tombs, 51–54.
[87]Rougerie. *"Mouvement Ouvrier a Paris,"* 38, and Wolfe, 377.

Committee with a new organization, the Delegation of the Twenty Arrondissements, seen as the first step toward the establishment of a "revolutionary commune" in Paris. According to all accounts, while many local-level Internationalists participated in the Delegation's founding, Frankel, Varlin, and the other leading figures on the Federal Council played no prominent role and quite likely had no direct involvement. Indeed, the *comité d'initiative*, operating as an ad-hoc executive council, listed in the organization's January 6 minutes consists exclusively of ardent Blanquists.[88] Further evidence of Frankel's and his leading Internationalist comrades' absence from the Delegation is the famous second "*Affiche Rouge*," which first appeared throughout Paris on the morning of January 6 with its clarion call to "Make Way for the People, Make Way for the Commune." Beneath the proclamation the poster closed with 140 signatures of support, with only Malon representing the Federal Council. Of the other Internationalists who signed, all "had never been named to the Federal Council; they were local militants who were better known at the clubs and committees than at the Corderie."[89] Accounting for the non-participation (or exclusion) of Frankel and the other Federal Council leaders from this new nexus of radical activity is necessary.

A number of factors contributed to the International's Federal Council's weakness as the siege entered into its most trying and potentially most volatile period. It is apparent that even by the beginning of January 1871 the French International had not recovered from the leadership vacuum created by the crackdown in the last days of the Second Empire. Frankel himself cites this during Federal Council meeting, stating that

---

[88]Minutes reproduced in Rougerie, "Quelques documents nouveaux," 25.
[89]Wolfe, 379. The list of the "*Afficihe Rouge*," signers appears in Dautry and Scheler, 147–48.

"since September 4, events have scattered the International to the four winds… (thus) we lack an effective physical structure because of a weak organization."[90] While this long term organizational issue accounts for some problems, Frankel's and the other Federal Council members' indecisiveness, particularly on October 31, contributed significantly to the erosion of their authority. This failure was clearly acknowledged by one of Frankel's comrades, who contended, "the International did not properly understand its role…If from the first day the International had lived up to its program, everything would have turned out differently, especially on October 31." Frankel, agreeing with this assessment, urged the development of a more coherent program to address these shortcomings to prevent future debacles.[91] However, by January the issuing of another program, as was done to little effect in November, likely would have done little to redress the damage already done to the Federal Council. As stated above, action independent of the Federal Council had become the norm for many neighborhood sections of the International, and proclamations alone seemed unlikely to bring them back into the fold.

Indeed, most of the Federal Council meetings during January, rather than tackling the broader issues, concentrated on the inability of the group to establish even a newspaper to convey their proposals to the larger Parisian radical community. This is particularly telling about the Federal Council's weakness, given that, as Frankel pointed out, two neighborhood sections established their own newspapers and "the International, with all the other sections united" could not raise the funds to do the same. However, shortly thereafter Frankel repeatedly commented on the lack of communication with the

[90]"Meeting of February 15" in Association Internationale des Travailleurs, *Séances officielles de l'Internationale Paris pendant la Commune—Procès verbaux* (Paris, 1872), 55–56.
[91]Ibid., "Meeting of January 19," 36–38.

local section and how their representatives' presence at the Federal Council was "indispensable." Obviously this undercut his earlier reference to the unity of all the sections and indicated the Federal Council's inability to exercise central control. In the end, Frankel, along with his frequent collaborator Varlin, admitted defeat and consented to using the Batignolles section's newspaper *Lutte à Outrance* to communicate with the Parisian masses.[92] Clearly by mid-January Frankel understood, as did his colleagues, that the Federal Council's authority and prestige had declined significantly and that decisive action was necessary to rectify the situation. For Frankel, this would entail further engagement with the broader Parisian radical community, more flexible coalition building, and, inevitably, greater ideological flexibility.

However, while Frankel and the Federal Council attempted to redress their newspaper deficiency, the siege and the Provisional Government's war effort moved rapidly toward a climax. On January 5, the Prussians began to shell the city, leading to hundreds of deaths and further fueling unrest. To quell this unrest, which constantly called for direct action by the National Guard against the Prussians, a final sortie was launched on January 19. Militarily ill-advised, the Provisional Government viewed this final effort as a means of placating the city's radicals to a degree prior to the impending capitulation. In addition, by placing the battalions from the radical districts in the front lines, it was hoped that the Prussians could aid the Provisional Government in dealing with its internal opponents. However, after the attack rapidly dissolved into chaos and a rout, the Provisional Government's military leaders openly declared their belief that further military action was futile and terms must be sought. This, unsurprisingly,

[92]Ibid., "Meeting of January 5," 8–11.

infuriated the Parisian Left and thus led to the final clash during the siege between its radicals and the so-called "Government of National Defection."[93]

The radical response to Paris's impending surrender came within days. The Delegation and its *comité d'initiative* began on January 21 to organize a revolt to seize the Hôtel de Ville and officially establish Paris's revolutionary commune. Working rapidly, the Delegation's largely Blanquist leadership managed to unite a widely diverse force for the following day's *coup*, including Blanquist-dominated National Guard battalions, prominent radical republicans/Neo-Jacobins, and several neighborhood sections of the International.[94] Once again the Federal Council itself apparently had no direct involvement *as a body* in the planning or preparation for the move on the Hôtel de Ville. However, when the city's radical forces began marching on the Hôtel de Ville the following afternoon, Frankel, as well as Varlin, Malon, and most of the Federal Council's other leaders, could be found within their ranks, a stark contrast to the October 31 insurrection. Nevertheless, this did not signal the last minute inclusion of the International's Federal council; rather, Frankel and his comrades all participated in the January 22 *Journée* in capacities outside of their leadership roles in the Federal Council. Frankel it appears marched with his National Guard battalion from the 11th *arrondissement*, while his comrades Varlin and Malon appeared as a representative from the 6th *arrondissement* vigilance committee and as the 17th *arrondissement's* assistant

[93]Shaler, 53; Edwards, 104–07.
[94]Arthur Arnould, *Histoire populaire et parlementaire de la Commune de Paris* (New York: AMS Press, 1978), 73.

mayor respectively.[95] This indicates that even while Frankel agonized over the daunting challenges faced by the Federal Council, he still remained engaged with the larger Parisian radical community, participating in political actions not directly connected with his role in the International.

Regardless of these efforts by Frankel and others, the January 22 *Journée* ended not just in failure but in the first bloodshed between the city's radicals and the Provisional Government. The Government, not wanting a repeat of October 31, heavily fortified the Hôtel de Ville and filled it with loyal Breton *Mobiles*. After an afternoon of tense confrontation, nerves broke and the Bretons opened fire. As Louise Michel describes it, "the bullets…make their hail-like noise…the square became deserted while the projectiles coming from the Hôtel de Ville dug into the ground haphazardly and killed people here and there."[96] When the firing ceased, at least five radicals and bystanders lay dead with eighteen more wounded, among them Frankel himself, who sustained a minor but painful flesh wound to his shoulder. This clash, the only civil spilling of blood during the siege, served as an ominous harbinger of things to come. However, for Frankel himself, it served to reinforce the necessity of greater participation by the Federal Council in events. At a Federal Council meeting held four days later, Frankel responded to his comrades repeated assessments of January 22 by stating, "Let us concentrate less on January 22 and more on the future…if we go out among the people, appealing to them properly, we can win over the masses."[97] While Frankel's personal network allowed him

[95]Leo Frankel Dossier BB24 862, and Maurice Foulon, *Eugène Varlin, relieur et membre de la Commune* (Clermont-Ferrand: Éditions Mont-Louis, 1934), 47.
[96]Michel, 62.
[97]*Séances officielles de l'Internationale*. "Meeting of January 26," 47–48.

to interact with the wider radical community, promoting the Federal Council's reengagement entailed the re-forging of organizational ties that had lapsed during the siege. Events, once again, would intercede to facilitate this process.

On January 28, 1871, after a siege of more than four-months, the Provisional Government signed an armistice with Bismarck and the Prussians. This armistice provided Adolphe Thiers, Jules Favre, and the other negotiators with twenty-one days to organize elections for a national assembly charged with ratifying a permanent peace treaty. These rapid elections, leaving little time for electioneering, were not a purely Prussian demand. Rather, Thiers and his fellow bourgeois republicans saw this as an opportunity to isolate the capital's radicals politically, a necessary first step in their vision of restoring national order. These circumstances, coupled with the Federal Council's lack of influence, propelled Frankel and his colleagues to engage in serious and rapid coalition building with several leftist groups previously considered ideologically incompatible. Unfortunately, due to a gap in the Federal Council's minutes, only a short glimpse of this discussion is provided. At the close of the session, one member asserted that "the Republic is in danger… (thus) we must unite with the republicans to defend it." Frankel, the acting chairperson of the meeting, indicated his agreement with the sentiments but stated that a final vote must wait for the presence of more local section representatives.[98] However, within days, members of the Federal Council began cooperating actively and openly with the much more ideologically diverse Delegation of the Twenty Arrondissements in preparation for the February 8 elections announced along with the

[98]Ibid, 49–50.

armistice.[99] This strongly indicates that the vote Frankel discussed on January 26 had gone in favor of such collaboration.

However, for Internationalists such as Frankel, creating a joint list of candidates for Paris's forty-three Assembly seats necessitated significant negotiations and ideological concessions. The first recorded public discussion of a candidates' list, which occurred at the club *Réunion de la Cour de Miracles* on February 1, included a mish-mash of Leftists, ranging from Blanqui to Garibaldi, from Louis Blanc to Victor Hugo, as well as prominent members of the International.[100] During the next six days, hard negotiations eventually led to the exclusion of most radical republicans, who refused to appear on an electoral list with Blanqui and his followers. This action caused at least three neighborhood International sections hostile to the Blanquists to break with the Federal Council's electoral strategy and endorse a list containing the radical republicans and excluding the Blanquists.[101] Finally, on February 6, two days before the election, the International and its coalition formalized their union by announcing the founding of a Revolutionary Socialist Party and posting its platform and candidates' list throughout Paris. For Internationalists like Frankel, the Revolutionary Socialist Party platform presented a mixed ideological bag. The political language in the document was deliberately vague, stating that as a "party of the dispossessed" the Revolutionary Socialists demanded "workers to have political power." The vagueness was a necessity given the ideological gulf on that issue existing between the Internationalists and the Blanquists. Obviously the reference to the "handing over to the workers their tools of

[99]Johnson, 57.
[100]Molinari, 282–85.
[101]Rougerie, *"Mouvement Ouvrier a Paris,"* 42.

production" resonated with Frankel's ideological conceptions; however, this is followed a few words later by a call to act "just as the Republic of 1792," a display of the revolutionary anachronism roundly condemned by the International.[102] Frankel's assent to this political compromise was confirmed by his appearance as one of the forty-three Revolutionary Socialists candidates for Paris.

While Frankel's candidacy, along with nearly all of the Federal Council's major figures, provides evidence of the International's willingness to compromise ideologically, it also raises interesting questions regarding the ability of Frankel as a foreigner to compete for national office. Frankel was not the only non-Frenchman on the Revolutionary Socialist Party's electoral list; Giuseppe Garibaldi, the Italian revolutionary and adventurer, was also listed among their candidates. Here the context of war and republicanism is of particular import, as well as the conception of citizenship first posited during the French Revolution. Prior to 1793, foreign supporters of the Revolution were welcomed and, as long as they adhered to the Revolution's principles, were granted the same rights and privileges open to all Frenchmen.[103] In addition to this inheritance, the view in 1871 was that as "a result of the revolutionary wars themselves…arms could make the citizen" and thus "foreigners serving with the French thus became citizens *de facto*."[104] Thus Frankel, given his service in the National Guard during the Siege, had gained for himself the rights open to all French citizens, including the right to run for public office.

---

[102]"Assemblee Nationale Candidats Socialistes Revolutionnaires" reproduced in Rougerie. *Paris Libre,* 77–78.
[103]Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and German* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992), 44–45.
[104]Bertrand Taithe, *Citizenship and Wars: France in Turmoil 1870–71* (London: Routledge, 2001), 42.

Despite the Left's rapid organizational efforts and ability to run even *étranger* candidates, the February 8 election for the National Assembly proved an utter disaster at the national level. Nearly 400 of those elected to the Assembly were conservatives/monarchists of various stripes, versus only about 150 republicans. Paris, along with a few other cities, provided the exception; nearly all of the forty-three seats in Paris were won by pro-war republican candidates with only one member of the Provisional Government being elected within the city.[105] However, only five of these forty-three came from the Revolutionary Socialist Party's list, and this included Garibaldi, who appeared on many lists. Only two Federal Council members, Malon and Tolain, were elected and both allowed their names to appear on other lists as well.[106] Varlin received only 53,199 votes and Frankel's total appears to have numbered only a few thousand, totals far from indicative of widespread support.[107] Again, the short period for campaigning (only ten days) clearly played a major role in the poor showing of many Internationalists and other radical leaders in the February 8 elections. Name recognition also played a prominent role in deciding the outcome of the election within Paris, with Victor Hugo, Louis Blanc, and other notables from the 1848 Revolution winning the largest vote totals in the city.

---

[105]Tombs, 62–63.

[106]Malon's election via his inclusion on the "bourgeois" lists produced significant discord within the International. Serraillier reported to the General Council in London that prior to the election, Frankel had approached Malon about his appearance on the "bourgeois" list and urged him to have it removed. Though Malon claimed it had been placed there without his permission, he expressed to Frankel that, given the choice, he preferred to remain on the bourgeois list. Following the Commune, Malon would have a major falling out with Marx, Frankel, and the International in general. See *Documents of the First International*, 141–43, n. 128, 512.

[107]Rougerie, *"Mouvement Ouvrier a Paris,"* 43–44.

Leo Frankel's response to the electoral defeat of February 8 seems to have manifested in a renewed devotion to strict (verbal, at least) re-adherence to Internationalist ideology. His statements during this period are of significant note, not only because of their relevance to contemporary events but also because of their effect on historians' characterization of Frankel's ideological position as unvaryingly "Marxist" throughout the siege and Commune.[108] One of these pronouncements is Frankel's assessment of the failure of February 8 and how the French Branch should respond (given at the Federal Council meeting on February 15):

> Many members do not understand the aims of the Association. Thus many members do not understand why, in drawing up the list of socialist candidates, we included obscure names instead of Louis Blanc and Victor Hugo. It is simply that we are eager to see the election of workers, members of the International. It is unfortunate that there has been little understanding of the objectives that the Association has to pursue. We need a vigorous organization comprising disciplined sections…consistently holding fast to the ideas of the International, without wavering.[109]

The other statement, made five days earlier at meeting of the Delegation, addressed what the radical response should be to the likely Prussian occupation of Paris. While many members spoke in favor of violent resistance, Frankel proposed greeting Bismarck's forces with a city festooned with alternating black and red flags inscribed with the names of "German democrats" such as Liebknecht and Jacoby under the banner "*République Universelle*." While this motion was rejected, this proposal, along with his February 15 assessment of the French Branch, has led several historians to thus label Frankel as the

---

[108]Describing Frankel as a "Marxist" in this context references his perceived personal loyalty to the ideological model favored by Marx and the International's General Council in London. Most general works on the Commune tend to pigeonhole Frankel with such a label. See Edwards, 121; Shafer, 124; Johnson, 195; and Tombs, 91.

[109]*Séances officielles de l'Internationale*. "Meeting of February 15," 55–56.

"most fervent disciple of internationalism," "close to Marx," or the Commune's lone Marxist.[110] While these two statements seem to lend credence to such an assessment, both need to be taken in the larger context of Frankel's *activities* during both the siege and subsequently during the Commune. As was the case with Frankel and the Federal Council in their meetings prior to entering first the Delegation and then the Revolutionary Socialist Party, statements often failed to reflect the actual policies adopted and acted upon. In addition, Frankel, along with his colleagues, often acted as *individuals* during the siege, thus freeing them to a degree from any ideological boundaries placed upon them as Internationalists. While the disappointing February 8 elections prompted a degree of disengagement on Frankel's part from the political realities of the moment, the rapidity at which events began to move from February to March drew Frankel back into the Parisian radical *milieu*.

The ramifications of the February 8 election quickly made themselves apparent, as the intensely conservative National Assembly first gathered in Bordeaux. One of its first acts involved expelling Garibaldi on February 13, sending a clear message to Parisian radicals as to its mood toward the city and the republic.[111] In response, the Delegation began discussions on further solidifying the Socialist Revolutionary Party created for the election into a vehicle capable of taking direct revolutionary action. In the last recorded Delegation debate before the Revolutionary Socialist Party's February 20/23 "*Déclaration de Principes*," Frankel openly stated his support for strong action,

[110]Tombs, 81; Edwards, 384; Johnson, 66; and Vincent, 108.
[111]Horne, 258.

asserting that "Compromise destroys one party after another."[112] On February 20 and 23, as Thiers was preparing to convey Bismarck's terms to the National Assembly, the Delegation issued its "*Déclaration de Principes*," which presented the political basis for revolutionary action in Paris if events made it necessary. Like the principles stated prior to the election, this document represents compromise for Frankel and Varlin, both of whom contributed to its drafting. While its talk of the abolition of classes and "social equality," as well as its call to place its facilities in the service of the International Working Men's Association, meshed well with Internationalist principles, many other elements represent clear compromise. The clear call for direct political action and the "assumption of political power by the workers" denotes the influence of the Delegation's numerous Blanquists, who's revolutionary Bonapartism had previously been opposed by the French Branch. Further, its talk of the "revolutionary Communes of the country and…principal workers' centers" clearly reflects, as Johnson notes, "Proudhon's federalism," long the target of Internationalist critique. Nevertheless, Frankel and his Internationalist colleagues, driven by the shared experience of the siege and the National Assembly's impending challenge, looked beyond their ideological differences in favor of this joint radical action.[113]

While the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Delegation organized themselves, the National Assembly approved on February 28 the humiliating peace dictated by Bismarck, which stripped France of Alsace/Lorraine, burdened it with massive

---

[112]Delegation minutes reproduced in Dautry and Scheler, 191.

[113]"*Déclaration de Principes*" reproduced in Rougerie, *Paris Libre*, 78–80. Johnson's analysis of this document represents a departure from earlier assessments, which projected Marx's concept of "the dictatorship of the proletariat onto this document. Johnson places it much more firmly in the context of Parisian radical events. See Johnson, 69–74.

reparations, and allowed the Prussians a triumphal march through Paris. Even before the February 28 Treaty, groups outside of the Delegation and the Revolutionary Socialist Party had begun making preparations for the impending confrontation with Thiers and the National Assembly. Most significant was the growing organizational efforts among the National Guard's "red" battalions. While some electoral organizing occurred within its battalions prior to the February 8 election in the weeks that followed these organizational efforts expanded and broadened, driven largely by the National Assembly's stated intention to disarm the Guard and end its daily 30 *sous* pay (this was done on February 15). By the third week of February, the "red" National Guard, numbering roughly 200 battalions, agreed to federate and elected a Central Committee as a governing body for the Guard, which declared itself dedicated to three principles: to resist any efforts to disarm the Guard; resist any Prussian occupation of the city; and to be governed by itself.[114]

Initially, Frankel and his Federal Council colleagues viewed this new organization skeptically due to its lack, aside from a devotion to general republican principles, of any clear ideological adherence. While discussing joining a mass protest the National Guard Central Committee was organizing for February 24, Frankel stated that though he was "very sympathetic" to protest against the pending peace treaty, he felt that the Federal Council would be best served by studying specific issues so that he, as the Council's chosen liaison, could communicate them to Malon and Tolain in Bordeaux.[115] However, following the mass demonstration at the Place de la Bastille on February 24, organized to

[114]Edwards, 121–23.
[115]*Séances officielles de l'Internationale*, "Meeting of February 22," 67. Frankel's role as liaison to the Internationalist representatives at Bordeaux is discussed in *Documents of the First International*, 141.

honor the anniversary of the 1848 Revolution but serving as a clear show of force, the National Guard Central Committee grew significantly in influence, particularly as it began seizing arms throughout Paris, including 300–400 cannons that it installed in Montmartre and Belleville.

Recognizing this power shift among radicals, Frankel and his fellow Federal Council members began debating on March 1 whether or not the International should join the Central Committee. Frankel appeared initially skeptical, fearing that joining the diverse Central Committee might be viewed as a "compromise with the bourgeoisie" and that perhaps time was needed for further discussion, particularly among the local sections. Other Federal Council members expressed their reservations as well. Although, as Lissagaray notes, these objections may have been prompted by "a jealous reserve" toward this new Committee made up of "unknown men, who had never taken part in any revolutionary campaign."[116] Finally Varlin, while recognizing the caution of Frankel and others, asserted that "if we remain outside of this force our influence may disappear, while if we join with this committee it will be a big step forward in the future of socialism." Convinced by Varlin, Frankel and the Council members voted to send a four man delegation to the National Guard Central Committee.[117] While these four named delegates did not include Frankel, Varlin further encouraged his Federal Council comrades to attend the Central Committee meetings, as well as National Guard events, "not as members of the International but as National Guards working to win over the spirit of that assembly." Based on his existing affiliation with the 11th *Arrondissement's*

[116]Lissagaray, 65.
[117]*Séances officielles de l'Internationale*, "Meeting of March 1, 82–87.

66th Battalion, it is fair to assume that Frankel took Varlin's advice and began engaging politically with his comrades in arms. Indeed, by March 15 so many Internationalists followed Varlin's suggestion that its members became the largest ideological group identified at the Central Committee's meetings.[118] Unquestionably, at the leadership level, Frankel, despite some personal reservations, again operated with a clear understanding of the pro-Central Committee current driving Parisian radicals by late February and thus favored coalition once again over ideological purity.

As Frankel and the other Federal Council members solidified their connections with the National Guard Central Committee, tensions between radical Paris and the National Assembly hurtled toward the breaking point. After concluding its business in Bordeaux, which focused heavily on overturning the emergency measures on rents passed while Paris was besieged, the National Assembly voted to move not to the capital but to the former royal seat of Versailles. Few radical Parisians failed to recognize the symbolic portent of this act. Secretly, Thiers also gave orders for regular army units to prepare to enter the city and disarm the National Guard, particularly by seizing the artillery parks in Montmartre and Belleville. This effort, attempted early on Saturday March18, rapidly degenerated into a disaster for the government forces. Radicals operating at the neighborhood level responded rapidly, soon supported by many regulars who sided with the Guardsmen. By day's end Thiers and nearly all vestiges of the Versailles Government were driven from the city in a spontaneous, decentralized popular uprising. Thus, unheralded, arrived the hour of the Revolutionary Commune.

For Paris's radicals, including Frankel and most of his fellow Internationalists, the

[118]Johnson, 76–77.

suddenness of the March 18 Revolution undercut all the planning and organizational efforts they had undertaken over the previous months. As Horne aptly observes, "for such a contingency nothing like a plan had been prepared and…the reaction was completely spontaneous and uncoordinated."[119] The Federal Council did not meet formally to discuss events until March 18, leaving its members as free agents. Frankel's personal actions on the March 18 are unknown; however, given that his close comrade Varlin, along with other Federal Council members, operated as a National Guardsman and participated in the uncoordinated seizure of strategic positions within Paris following the Government's flight, its seems likely that Frankel, too, joined in these efforts.[120] By the following morning, Paris's radical forces had established clear military control over the city; however, establishing a new political order proved a much more complex endeavor. At the Hôtel de Ville, the Central Committee of the National Guard assumed temporary political power with the stated goal of organizing municipal elections for a Communal Council. This met with opposition from a significant portion of the Delegation and the neighborhood vigilance committees, who wanted a 1793-style Committee of Public Safety established to employ revolutionary means against the Versailles Government's anti-revolutionary efforts.[121]

Frankel and the Federal Council, meeting on March 22 and 23, engaged in this debate over elections and political power as well. Several members, still uncomfortable with the National Guard Central Committee's ideological diversity, opposed the International giving its support to the Central Committee overseeing any elections.

---

[119]Horne, 275.
[120]Edwards, 146.
[121]Johnson, 91.

Frankel, however, contended ardently that the International must support Communal elections, trying to mollify the opposition by arguing that giving such support was "not political anymore, but social" and thus within the International's traditional realm of action. Frankel, displaying the breathless enthusiasm that would characterize his statements over the ensuing week, further asserted that the International must support the Central Committee with "all our moral force," specifically by issuing a public manifesto articulating this position. Frankel's repeated calls finally swayed a majority within the Council, and it was agreed that Frankel, along with two other members, would craft this public endorsement of the Central Committee and Communal elections.[122] While others within the Council supported this action, Frankel, based on the debate's minutes, played the leading role in publically tying the International's French Branch to the soon to be established Paris Commune. The fact that Frankel, traditionally viewed as the Commune's most devoted "Marxist," led the charge within the Federal Council for elections proves particularly interesting given the stated views of Marx himself at the time. In a letter dated April 12, Marx, though effusive in his praise of the Communards, critiqued these rapid elections, stating that "the Central Committee surrendered its power too soon, to make way for the Commune…a too honorable scrupulousness!"[123]

Regardless of Marx's disapproval, the French Branch's manifesto of support, which appeared as a wall poster on March 24, demonstrated clearly how adroit Frankel (the primary author) had become in crafting appeals that effectively navigated the diverse ideologies of the Parisian radical community. After a preamble stating that the city's

---

[122]*Séances officielles de l'Internationale*, "Meetings of March 22/23," 125–37.
[123]"Letter, Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, April 12, 1871," *Collected Works 44*, 131.

older political order's "incapacity constitutes its negation," the manifesto goes on to outline the International's vision of the independent Paris Commune. While this section begins by asserting that the Commune will ensure "the emancipation of the working class" by "ending class conflict and (securing) social equality," it makes no specific statement that this would result from the exclusive political rule of the working class, a fundamental Internationalist conception. Clearly, given this document's intent to support the Central Committee's election-organizing efforts, a diverse body including non-socialist republicans, the exclusion of such class-based exclusionary language was essential. Beyond this political flexibility, the language Frankel utilizes in the realm of economics and financial policy also demonstrates strategic breadth. In discussing economics and labor under the Commune, the manifesto contends that "the organization of credit, of exchange, and of production co-operatives" will be essential to "guarantee the worker the full value of his labor."[124] The utilization of such language denotes an effort by Frankel and his comrades to appeal to the large body of Parisian workers still devoted to Proudhon's mutualist concepts. While Internationalists recognized the cooperative movement's vital contributions as early as 1864, Marx contended that cooperative movements can only be deemed a success when "fostered by national means" in a state where the working class has conquered political power.[125] Since the Commune made no claims to be exclusively working class in composition, as Frankel was well aware, this presents another example of Frankel's understanding of the ideological flexibility necessary to engage in Parisian radical discourse.

---

[124]Document reproduced in full in Rougerie. *Paris Libre*, 129–30.
[125]Karl Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association," in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), 512.

With the Federal Council's support and, more importantly, that of the majority of the Delegation and neighborhood committees, the Central Committee managed to coordinate Communal elections on March 26. Given the limited time for campaigning, few electoral lists appeared; however, the Delegation did assemble a list of radical candidates that exercised significant influence over the electorate. Interestingly, the Delegation listed Leo Frankel as a candidate for the 13th *arrondissement*, rather than his home district, the 11th. Electoral tactics most likely account for Frankel's political transfer. Examining the electoral slate, the 11th had six candidates already listed, including prominent figures such as Frankel's National Guard commander Avrial, as well as the prominent Blanquist Emile Eudes and the military adventurer "General" Cluseret, soon to be appointed the Commune's first Delegate of War. Though well known among prominent Parisian radicals and Internationalists, Frankel lacked the name recognition of these other candidates. Thus placing him on the 13th *arrondissement* list, a predominately bourgeois neighborhood with a smaller radical cadre increased the likelihood of his election.[126] Frankel's position on the Delegation list proved fortunate, as he, along with 49 of the 87 candidates on the Delegation's electoral list, won Commune seats, aided in large part by the tens of thousands of abstaining bourgeois voters. Frankel, the number four candidate elected in the 13th *arrrondissement*, won a seat with only 1,520 votes. In his home district, the 11th, the last candidate to win a seat, the *seventh* place winner, did so with 15,567 votes.[127] In addition, Frankel's three fellow candidates in the 13th were all radical republicans, further denoting the conservative bent of the district. However, the

[126]Delegation electoral list reproduced in Dautry and Scheler, 240–41.
[127]*Les Proces-Verbaux de la Commune*, vol. 1, 29.

fact that Leo Frankel, a Hungarian Jew residing in France only a few short years, had risen to a seat on the Commune's revolutionary government testifies to the broad connections he established within the Parisian radical network, as well as his capacity to operate within its internal structures successfully.

Networking and an understanding of Paris's radical political landscape constituted essential skills if Frankel hoped to play an influential role within a body as diverse as that elected to the Communal Council on March 26. The seventy-eight members who met regularly (with allowances for resignations, duplications, and deaths) represented nearly every stripe of Parisian radicalism, supplemented by a handful of moderates and conservatives. Most historians of the Commune shy away from neat ideological categorization, given the fluidity of individual identification; however, the largest identifiable groups consisted of the Blanquists, Neo-Jacobin Republicans, and Internationalists. While in strict membership terms 43 percent of Communal Council members were also members of the International, this statistic is misleading, given the ideological diversity even among those who claimed membership in the International.[128] Malon, in categorizing the Council's membership, only lists seventeen of its members as Internationalists, including Frankel, Varlin, Avrial, Lefrançais, and himself, a reckoning that, given subsequent events, much more accurately represents the French Branch's influence *as a body.*[129] Nevertheless, as individuals, Frankel and other prominent Federal Council members exercised significant influence and found themselves appointed to prominent positions on the nine commissions created by the Commune during a nearly

[128]See Rougerie, *"Mouvement Ouvrier a Paris,"* 59; Johnson, 104–05; and Serman, 276.
[129]Malon, 134–36.

twelve hour marathon session. Frankel, along with Malon and Avrial, were appointed to head the Commission of Labor and Exchange, with Frankel serving as chairman. Varlin, Frankel's longtime collaborator, was elected to both the Executive Commission and the Finance Commission. Most of the other seventeen men listed by Malon were appointed to commission positions as well.[130] Clearly the commission appointment indicates Frankel's radical connections beyond the Federal Council; however, even stronger evidence appeared at the following day's meeting. The Election Commission, reporting to the Communal Council after reviewing the March 26 vote, presented its view that the Council should accept foreigners into its ranks and recommended "that you offer the admission of Citizen Frankel," which was approved by a unanimous vote.[131] While this vote further reinforces the existence of Frankel's established connections far beyond the Federal Council, it also demonstrates a general regard among the radical community for Frankel's capacities, an appreciation likely developed through regular interaction with the Parisian Left's various elements. It also illustrates the acceptance and appreciation of some foreigners by the Commune's majority.

The Commune's establishment, coming after years of police repression coupled with the arduous siege, filled its members, as well as the Parisian radical masses, with a sort of revolutionary euphoria. Frankel, who had shared these travails with his Parisian revolutionary comrades, reflected this enthusiasm for and intoxication with the possibilities in his statements and writings immediately following his March 26 election. Speaking to his Federal Council colleagues on March 29, Frankel asserted that the

---

[130] *Proces-Verbaux*, 41.
[131] *Journal Officiel de la Commune de Paris du 20 mars au 24 mai 1871*, March 30, 1871, (Paris: 1872) *Bibliothèque nationale de France.*

moment to establish workers' rights by their ardent "fortitude and persuasion" had arrived. He further added, with a hint of bloody glee, that if the "despots" would not respect this right, they would have it conveyed through "a hail of bullets."[132] A letter to Marx written on March 30, the day of his official acceptance into the Communal Council, also demonstrated his fevered enthusiasm. Frankel, after noting his limited time to correspond due to his office, informed Marx of the mass approval of his election that day, despite his foreign status. Frankel's excitement was almost palpable, though he informs Marx if "this one act (was) the most gratifying" for him, it was only due to its "international character" rather than from a personal point of view. However, after this tempered opening, Frankel launched into the grandiose, proclaiming March 18 as potentially the most important revolution in recorded history, one that could, if successful, "remove every cause for future revolutions, since there would be no further social demand to be made." He felt this was particularly the right moment, since, in his view, "the proletariat of this country seems to me to be in the vanguard of the republican and social forces." After asserting that the Commune's victory must be achieved at all costs, he closed by asking for rapid advice from Marx, since "time presses" and "we must before all other things lay the foundations of the social republic."[133]

Frankel's understandable enthusiasm notwithstanding, this letter to Marx demonstrated how Frankel's experience within Paris transformed his perspective, bringing him into contention with Marx's and the General Council's assessment of the situation. Particularly noteworthy is Frankel's assessment of the French proletariat as a

---

[132]"Meetings of March 29," in *Séances officielles de l'Internationale*, 158.
[133]"Letter, Leo Frankel to Karl Marx, March 30, 1871," *The Paris Commune of 1871: The View from the Left*, 118.

revolutionary vanguard. Marx repeatedly asserted in his writings and statements that he viewed France's working class as underdeveloped and unprepared for revolution, a position of which Frankel was most certainly aware. Further, from September 4 on, Marx, along with the General Council, constantly encouraged the International to hold back from direct revolutionary activity, given both the ideological ill-preparedness of the French working class and the long odds of success.[134] Clearly Frankel's active role in events, combined with his personal radical connections within Paris, shaped his perceptions and led him to assess the situation in a manner divergent from Marx and the other London Internationalists. Though Marx and the General Council, "in spite of their warnings against premature revolution making," rendered Frankel and his comrades all possible aid during the Commune's brief existence, they retained their concerns about the long-term viability of the Parisian revolutionary project.[135] Frankel, despite his personal devotion to Marx and Internationalism, jettisoned such concerns during the heady days following the March 18 uprising and joined his radical comrades in constructing a "new world" in Paris.

Thus Leo Frankel and his comrades, having established the Communal government as a first step in creating the "social republic," set about restructuring Paris's existing order to achieve this end. Frankel, as the head Commissioner of Labor and Exchange, focused on laying the groundwork for labor's emancipation by redressing exploitative productive relations within the city. However, by early April Paris once

---

[134]See "Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, September 6, 1870," *Collected Works 44*, 113.
[135]A detailed assessment of Marx and the International's views and actions during the Siege and Commune is provided in August Nimtz, *Marx and Engels: Their Contribution to the Democratic Breakthrough* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 209–22.

again found itself besieged, this time by the Versailles government's forces, thus limiting the time and resources that could be devoted to this and other social measures. Nevertheless, Frankel, well-acquainted with the pressing labor issues within the city, managed to address some viewed as the most pressing. One that he particularly wished to address was the mandatory night work done by Parisian bakers, seen as inhumane and thus a target of radical critique. Even prior to the Commune, Frankel began doing background research to respond to bakery owners' argument that night work was traditional, countering that during the Middle Ages, bakers had only done day work and celebrated around 100 feast days per year.[136] Armed with his research, Frankel began crafting in early April an official Labor Commission statement ending this practice, coupled with a comprehensive justification for its abolition. However, on April 20, the Commune's Executive Commission, without Frankel's or the Commission's prior knowledge, abruptly outlawed all night work for bakers.[137] This precipitate action, taken without the preparation and justification Frankel intended to utilize, soon encountered extensive opposition. Bakery owners mobilized and within days presented the Communal Council with a petition, signed by over 850 owners and bakers that labeled the decree an attack on the owners' and workers' liberties. Prompted by these protests, a group of Commune members began pushing for the decree's repeal.

Frankel, though irritated by the Executive Council's ill-conceived actions, quickly rose to the night-baking ban's defense in a contentious Commune meeting on April 26. Though not hiding his annoyance that he and the other Labor and Exchange Commission

---

[136]"Meetings of January 19," in *Séances officielles de l'Internationale,* 33.
[137]*Journal Officiel*, April 20, 1871, 332.

members were not consulted, Frankel asserted that "nonetheless I support it (the decree) because I feel it is the only truly socialist decree passed by the Commune," taking into account the suffering of "the most unfortunate section of the proletariat." He emphasized the extensive study that he, Varlin, and Malon had made of the subject and that while it was the correct action, prior to such efforts in the future "the needs of the public must be considered and the people informed, so that they fully understand the benefits of the reform you are carrying out." He closed with a flourish (and his colleagues' applause), asserting that taking into account the owners concerns precluded change, proclaiming, "Were the employers consulted in '92? No!…The measure decreed is fair, we must therefore defend it."[138] Frankel's active participation in the night baking debate and his ardent defense of its abolition illustrate once again his awareness of the particular issues relevant to both working-class Frenchmen and his fellow radicals. Even after successfully defending the measure, he followed through on its enforcement, pushing the Commune on May 3 to give him authority to seize bread produced in violation of the law, which they granted.[139] Though enforcement was difficult, Frankel continued to pursue the issue, sending two representatives on May 15 to liaise with the Bakers' Union to ensure enforcement. So pleased were the bakers that they marched the following day to the Hotel de Ville with red flags and banners to thank the Commune for defending their interests.[140] Frankel's familiarity with this particularly Parisian issue provided him with both the motivation and the knowledge necessary to effect change at the grassroots level.

---

[138]*Proces-Verbaux,* 538–44.
[139]*Proces-Verbaux*, vol. 2, 99–110.
[140]*Journal Officiel*, May 17, 550.

While his work on the night baking issue demonstrated Frankel's detailed knowledge of Parisian labor issues, his involvement with workers' co-operatives once again illustrated his capacity to operate within the established structural constraints of Parisian radicalism. On April 16, the Commune issued a decree, crafted by Frankel and the other Labor and Exchange Commissioners, declaring that all workshops "abandoned by their managements without any regard for the interests of their workers" could be seized and reopened as worker co-operatives. While hailed by some later Marxists as the Commune establishing state control over the means of production, this move by Frankel and his colleagues rather embodied the kind of cooperative socialism common in Proundhonian thought long denounced by Marx. The decree makes clear that this effort did not constitute nationalization or even an attack on private property, including a provision to provide eventually "upon the return of the…employers" compensation for their losses.[141] Despite his economic views as an Internationalist, Frankel recognized that, given the diverse ideological positions held by his fellow Communards, such policies must be an exercise in compromise. Workers' co-operatives, operating *within* the existing economic order, had a long tradition in France, being first introduced on a large scale in 1848 under Louis Blanc's short-lived National Workshops program.[142] Frankel and his comrades understood that utilizing a policy with a historical and cultural precedent was necessary, given the Commune's vital need for unity in the face of the looming threat posed by the Versaillaise forces.

[141] *Journal Officiel*, April 17, 1871, 286.
[142] Edwards, 260–61.

Despite these limitations, Frankel and the Commission of Labor and Exchange played an active role in promoting the formation of co-operatives. By mid-May at least forty-three producers' co-operatives had been established in diverse fields ranging from tailors and engineers to café waiters and concierges.[143] That Frankel and the Commission served as facilitators of these efforts is demonstrated by several sources. Members of these co-operatives wrote frequently to the Commission and its members for aid, particularly in the form of government contracts. One letter, addressed to Frankel's close comrade and fellow Commission member Avrial, asserts that by providing arms contracts to the Iron Foundry co-operative, the Labor and Exchange Commission would promote "a great step forward for the social democracy towards which we are all striving."[144] Another letter, addressed directly to the Commission by a stone-carver, outlines a fairly detailed plan to facilitate co-operative grown within Paris. The author asserts that, if implemented by the Commission, "the system of co-operative associations will become universal… (and) we will have thus succeeded in obtaining control over our own production." Clearly, Parisian co-operative members saw the Commission of Labor and Exchange, headed by Frankel, as an essential partner in promoting worker-controlled production. Indeed, Frankel's role in promoting co-operatives extended beyond traditional working-class fields and into the arts. During April and May, several theater co-operatives appeared, aimed at allowing entertainers to profit directly from their work rather than operating through traditional middlemen. On May 19, in a debate over whether government support of these associations threatened artistic freedom of

[143]Ibid., 264.
[144]Text reproduced in Jacques Rougerie, *Procès des Communards* (Paris: Julliard, 1964), 225–26

expression, Frankel actively supported the Blanquist Edouard Valliant, head of the Education Commission, in arguing that the Commune had an obligation to "end all exploitation," thus making affiliation with these artist co-operatives necessary. Convinced by Frankel and Valliant's arguments, the Commune voted in their favor.[145] In attempting to reorder Paris's productive relations, co-operative members of all stripes viewed Frankel's Labor and Exchange Commission as an accessible and valuable ally in their efforts. Frankel, despite any personal ideological reservations, proved to be an active and vocal advocate of their efforts, particularly at the Communal level.

However, despite his earnest support of co-operative efforts under the Commune, events and political realities forced Frankel at times, despite deep personal reservations, to compromise on his support of the co-operative movement in favor of more capitalistic arrangements. This is most clearly demonstrated in the controversy over awarding military supply contracts. Given Paris's renewed investment by mid-April, this time by the Versaillasie forces, providing essential military materials for the National Guard constituted one of the Commune's primary concerns. However, meeting these military needs rapidly and at the lowest possible cost brought it into conflict with the co-operatives, who felt that the Commune's capitalistic buying practices undercut its essential economic and social mission. Essentially, the workers' co-operatives found themselves unable to compete with established capitalist factories, which could supply arms and equipment reliably and cheaply. By late April, multiple co-operatives began protesting this state of affairs. The Tailor's Co-operative, after having their contracts for

[145]*Proces*-Verbaux, vol. 2, 425–30. A more detailed discussion of the relationship between theaters and the Commune is provided in Johnson, 148–52.

2000 uniforms cancelled in favor of a capitalist concern, protested that "we…who have always considered the Revolution of 1871 to be based on the emancipation of the Proletariat find ourselves regretfully obliged to stop work due to the efforts of Capital."[146] Similarly, the Shoemakers' Union protested that the large Godillot shoe factory received all of the National Guard's footwear contracts due to its lower production costs. They countered that the Commune should be willing to pay more for shoes to support worker-run industries like theirs.[147]

Frankel, prompted by these protests, ordered the Commission of Labor and Exchange on May 4 to investigate the contract bidding and award system utilized by the Commune. On May 12 Frankel went before the Commune and presented an impassioned report, which asserted that the present policies on contracts showed "a lack of harmony between the policies of the Government and its socialist principles." Though starting with this ideological assertion, the report in total illustrates the political skills Frankel had developed during his time in Paris, utilizing arguments targeted at appealing to the Commune's diverse supporters. While he employs a conventional socialist critique focusing on unscrupulous businessmen "filling their pockets" at the workers' expense, he also uses time-honored fiscal arguments as well, contending that not supporting the co-operatives would lead to unemployment and a need for public assistance that would "result in a burden on public funds." Popular patriotism is utilized as well, reminding the Commune that "the worker is getting killed on the ramparts to put an end to this every kind of exploitation." Supported by these different arguments, Frankel concluded by

[146]Text reproduced in Rougerie, *Proces des Communards*, 226–27.
[147]Edwards, 265.

calling on the Commune to award contracts only to workers' co-operatives and to establish set prices through arbitration between the Commune and the co-operatives. To hammer his point home, Frankel added some additional commentary at the end of the report, stating "we must not forget that the Revolution of March 18 was won solely by the working class…If we can do nothing to assist this class…I can see no reason for the Commune's existence."[148]

However, despite these strong sentiments, the ensuing debate diluted Frankel's demands by claiming military necessity as a mitigating factor in economic policy. In the end, the Commune's decree, published on May 13, stated only that "preference" be given to workers' co-operatives in awarding contracts, though Frankel's Commission was given the authority to revise existing contracts and include language establishing a minimum wage rate.[149] Even after being granted these powers, Frankel, supported by Varlin, expressed reservations about breaking contracts lest they slow critical supplies and it is unlikely any contracts were thus revised. While advocating with some success for workers' co-operatives, Frankel, prompted by the military situation and the need for consensus, bowed to the Commune's majority and allowed private interests to continue receiving some government contracts. This case again illustrates his capacity to serve the Commune effectively and to further its overall success even when its policies diverged from his ideological principles.

Though Frankel's work as the Commission of Labor and Exchange's chairman led him to make repeated ideological and political compromises, it also contributed to his

[148]*Proces-Verbaux*, vol. 2, 348–56.
[149]*Journal Officiel*, May 14, 551.

involvement in other issues of concern to Parisian radicals. In particular, Leo Frankel used his Commission position to advocate for an expanded role for women in the Commune's economic efforts. While earlier contacts with such radical women as Nathalie Lemel and André Léo likely influenced Frankel, the arrival of Elizabeth Dmitrieff, sent by Marx to Paris in late March, provided much greater impetus to his efforts. In early April, Dmitrieff founded the *Union des femmes* and immediately began advocating for the Commune's support in organizing Paris's women politically and economically. In late April, Dmitrieff addressed a letter to Frankel's Commission that outlined a plan to organize women's work at the arrondissement level both to aid the Commune and to provide economic support for struggling women, lest a "state of continual privation relapse them into the more or less reactionary and passive position the social order…marked out for them."[150] Following this letter, Frankel and Dmitrieff began collaborating closely on promoting the *Union des femmes* co-operative organizing efforts and established both a professional and personal rapport. Indeed, Frankel, taken by Dmitrieff's organizational brilliance, ardent radicalism, and oft-remarked upon beauty, developed a romantic interest that was not reciprocated.[151]

Affairs of the heart notwithstanding, Frankel began working in support of women's co-operatives, providing Commission funding for materials and equipment and for the establishment of small coordinating offices in each arrondissement. At the Commune's May 4 meeting, Frankel addressed the issue of expanding government funding for women's work. Knowing that Proudhon's ideas on women heavily

[150]Full text of letter reproduced in Rougerie, *Proces des Communards*, 228–29.
[151]Yvonne Singer-Lecocq, *Rouge Elisabeth* (Paris; Editions Stock, 1977), 173–74.

influenced many of his colleagues, Frankel framed the argument in terms of military expedience, asserting that employing women would increase war material production. He also appealed to patriotism, contending that paying women would supplement their husbands' meager National Guard pay, thus sparing them suffering while their men fought. Finally, with a nod towards the Proudhonists, supporting the organization of women's work at the arrondissement level would "bring work to women so they could stay in their households."[152] Despite Frankel's clever political maneuvering, the Commune declined to take immediate large-scale action. Nevertheless, Frankel continued to work with Dmitrieff and the Union, signing as Commissioner of Labor and Exchange a poster calling for a mass meeting on May 17 to establish women's unions in each profession to collaborate with their male counterparts.[153] Frankel's advocacy work with Dmitrieff demonstrates once again Frankel's ability to operate within the Commune's ideological structures, tailoring his approach to preempt his Proudhonist comrades' objections. Further, it illustrates how his personal radical connections forged within Paris influenced his political actions.

Though circumstances often forced ideological and political compromises, the Commission of Labor and Exchange under Frankel collectively oversaw policies that, as Stuart Edward states, "constituted the socialist work of the Commune, as the term was understood at the time."[154] However, this assessment cannot be applied to Frankel's political endeavors during the Commune. Following the National Guard's failed sortie

---

[152]*Proces-Verbaux*, vol. 2, 226–33.
[153]Poster reproduced in *The Paris Commune: The View from the Left*, 178–79.
[154]Edwards, 250. His analysis is representative of the general scholarly consensus on the Commission of Labor and Exchange.

against Versailles on April 3, the Commune's military situation gradually worsened as Thiers mobilized an army from the provinces and soldiers recently released from Prussian captivity. Led by Bonapartist generals and containing most of France's remaining professional army, the Versailles forces reinvested the city and began reducing its fixed fortifications, often facilitated by the National Guard's inexperience and ineptitude. However, ineffective leadership played an even more prominent role, particularly at the Communal level, with militarily unschooled radicals constantly attacking the Commune's handful of experienced military leaders, particularly Gustave Cluseret, an able professional soldier whose efforts to train and discipline the National Guard alienated many communards.[155] This combination greatly facilitated the Versailles Army's efforts and by late April they had captured most of Paris's outer defenses, thus placing them in position for an assault on the city itself. Faced with this crisis, radicals within the city once again looked to the past for inspiration and focused their gaze on 1792 and the Great Revolution's moment of military crisis.

Mining the revolutionary tradition, in late April radical newspapers and clubs began demanding the establishment of a new Committee of Public Safety, vested with dictatorial powers and thus capable of redeeming and reinvigorating the Commune's war effort. For Internationalists such as Frankel, this, in ideological terms, constituted the height of folly. Marx had long condemned this practice, famously urging the French after the failure of 1848 to "let the dead bury their dead" and look to the present rather than the past for revolutionary inspiration. As recently as September 1870, Marx warned French radicals that they must not "allow themselves to be deluded by the national *souvenirs* of

[155]Tombs, 154–56.

1792," rather they must "build for the future."[156] Frankel, along with other Federal Council members, condemned this tendency among their French radical comrades at meetings just prior to March 18. Indeed, when debate began on creating this Committee on April 28, most Federal Council members vocally denounced it; however, after two days of debate the motion passed by a narrow margin of thirty-four to twenty-eight. Explaining their vote collectively, Varlin, Malon, Avrial, Lefrançais, Serraillier,[157] and nearly every other major Internationalist asserted that the Committee of Public Safety's creation amounted to "the creation of a dictatorship" that constituted "a veritable usurpation of the sovereign rights of the people."[158] However, one prominent Internationalist did not lend his name to this condemnation because of his vote in the affirmative. Leo Frankel, the Commune's lone "Marxist" and foreign representative, approved of the resurrection of this monument to French revolutionary chauvinism. Why?

Not due to any ardent support for the institution, as his justification for his vote clearly indicates: "Although I cannot see the usefulness of this Committee I do not wish to give reason for attacks against my revolutionary socialist opinions…While I reserve the right to revolt against the Committee, I vote in favor."[159] Obviously other factors than ideological conversion were in play, one in particular being Frankel's position as a foreigner. On April 25, in a letter to Marx, Frankel indicated that his Prussian citizenship

---

[156]Karl Marx. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 594–617; and Karl Marx, "Second Address of the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War," *Civil War in France*, 28–35. Edwards also remarks upon Marx's condemnation of the French obsession with the revolutionary tradition, 229–30.

[157]Serraillier, at the prompting of the General Council, secretly entered Paris in late March/early April and was elected to the Commune in a bi-election in mid-April.

[158]*Proces-Verbaux*, vol. 2, 34.

[159]Ibid, 35.

had subjected him to attacks by "enemies of the Commune." While he noted this included the reactionary press, this seems to include internal enemies as well, particularly Felix Pyat, a Neo-Jacobin journalist and Commune member. Marx, in his reply on April 26, attacked Pyat vehemently and counseled Frankel and the other Internationalists to be wary of this "dirty schemer."[160] Pyat proved to be one of the most vocal advocates of the Committee of Public Safety's establishment and was appointed as one of its five members. It appears, based on these letters and Frankel's comment regarding "attacks on his revolutionary socialist opinions," that Pyat and others made Frankel's nationality an issue within the debate, prompting him to consider that when casting his vote.

However, while insinuations about his Prussian citizenship likely played a role in Frankel's vote, his subsequent actions regarding the Committee of Public Safety indicate no major constraints on his political actions. While Frankel did not sign the statement by the "minority" on May 3 refusing to participate in this "plagiarization of the past,"[161] he did respond when "majority" members attacked this critique and one made ten days later as the work of counter-revolutionary Girondins. On May 15, Frankel signed a "Declaration of the Minority" condemning the Commune's "surrender of authority to a dictatorship" and proclaiming their dedication to remain "answerable to the voters and not to shelter behind a supreme dictatorship." Members of the majority took Frankel's signing of this document as his resignation from the Commune and recorded it thus in the

---

[160]"Letter, Leo Frankel to Karl Marx, April 25, 1871," in *Lettres de communards et de militants de la Ire Internationale à Marx, Engels et autres, dans les journées de la Commune de Paris en 1871*, ed. Jules Rocher (Paris: Bureau d'Editions, 1934), 38–39; and "Letter, Karl Marx to Leo Frankel, April 26, 1871," in *Collected Works* 44, 141–42.

[161]*Journal Officiel*, May 4, 1871, 457.

minutes.[162] However, Frankel disputed that his signature constituted his resignation and on May 17, delivered a response that, in addition to renouncing his apparent "resignation," provides his overriding justification for his affirmative vote for the Committee of Public Safety. After condemning the Girondins comment as historically ignorant, Frankel stated that, while he strongly disagreed with the Committee's creation, unless they chose to relieve him he intended to "stay in his Commission and continue his work in the interest of the worker."[163] Though Frankel did declare he would stand with the minority and not attend meetings not directly involving his Commission, his willingness to compromise and endorse an institution like the Committee of Public Safety indicates the strong radical ties Frankel developed in Paris. Further, it provides the sharpest example of his willingness to compromise ideological principles for the sake of the Commune's best interests.

While Frankel continued his Commission work despite the Committee of Public Safety's anachronistic reign, the Commune stood only a few days from its *Götterdämmerung*. While the Commune's "majority" and "minority" crossed swords, Thiers' troops, bolstered by another 100,000 men released from Bismarck's prison camps, moved into position for a final assault on Paris. Despite Marx's personal plea to Frankel and Varlin to "be on guard" and to focus on Paris's defenses rather than "trifles and personal squabbles," the Versailles Army took Frankel and the entire Commune leadership unaware when it entered the city via its unmanned southwestern defenses on May 21. This inaugurated the Commune's final chapter, the *Semaine Sanglante*, a week

[162]*Proces-Verbaux*, vol. 2, 373–74.
[163]Ibid., 397.

of bloody street fighting culminating in a political massacre on an unheralded scale. Leo Frankel, despite his foreign status, forewent the option of flight and chose instead to defend his belief in the Commune's revolutionary potential on the barricades. Records of individual activities are understandably limited from this chaotic period. However, multiple sources place Frankel in the thick of the fighting, first taking charge of barricade construction along the rue de Rivoli near the Place de Saint-Jacques.[164] While the Versailles forces easily advanced across Paris's bourgeois western districts, by May 25 they began meeting fierce resistance as they moved into the working-class eastern neighborhoods. Frankel, along with Varlin[165] and Elisabeth Dmitrieff, aided in defending the communard strongpoint at the Place de Bastille. Here the battle ended for Frankel, as well as Dmitrieff, as both were wounded too badly to continue. They were last recorded in Paris in the 11th arrondissement, unable to walk without mutual assistance.[166] Despite their wounds, Frankel and Dmitrieff eluded the authorities and by mid-June they managed to cross France secretly and arrive safely in Switzerland.

Leo Frankel's experiences both prior to and during the Commune illustrate the complex set of negotiations and compromises that foreign radicals with firm ideological principles underwent in their efforts to see Paris's revolution won and, ultimately, spread beyond its borders. Arriving in Paris as an earnest partisan of Marx's model of internationalism, Frankel immersion in Paris's complex and diverse transnational radical

---

[164]Martial Senisse, *Le Carnets d'un Federe de la Commune 1871,* ed. J.A Faucher (Paris: Collective, 1965), 137.

[165]Varlin, Frankel's long-time comrade, fought until May 28, when he was captured, beaten by his captors, and stoned by a crowd before being shot by a firing squad while crying "*Viva la Commune*!" Edwards, 338–39.

[166]Lissagaray, 379.

community taught him the necessity of political and organizational flexibility. This skill set became essential, first during the Prussian siege but most particularly during his service to the Commune. Though still committed to his Internationalist principles, his time on the Communal Council as Commissioner of Labor and Exchange became an exercise in compromise, forcing him to negotiate and, at times, concede his own radical principles for the sake of seeing Paris's revolution become the *République Universelle's* inaugural moment. As subsequent chapters shall demonstrate, Leo Frankel's experience as a non-French radical navigating the complex and at times difficult realities of Paris's transnational radical community for the sake of facilitating his own aspirations would not prove unique.

Chapter Three

A Russian de Gouges: Elisabeth Dmitrieff and the *Citoyennes* of Paris

In late April 1871, the General Council of the International received a letter from an enraged young Russian revolutionary, writing on behalf of her besieged Parisian comrades. The young Communard minced few words in expressing her frustration at the International's leadership, including its *de facto* leader Karl Marx: "How can you possibly stay there [in London] doing nothing when Paris is about to perish, because of people like you?"[1] This same young woman, only months before, had raptly listened as these same men instructed her on matters of revolutionary philosophy and organization. She even developed a close relationship with the Marx family, ending a letter on the Russian peasantry to Marx warmly requesting that if it would not be a burden on "his time," he free several hours on the next Sunday to spend with her and his daughters.[2] What can explain this rapid transformation?

For the woman in question, born Elisavieta Koucheleva but known among her fellow revolutionaries as Elisabeth Dmitrieff, the experience of transforming intellectual inquiry and radical philosophizing into practice as a participant in the Paris Commune account for these changes. Though spending much of her late teens immersed in radical study in St. Petersburg and Geneva as well as London, it was not until her arrival in Paris in late March of 1871 that she encountered the difficulties, compromises, and negotiations that occur while making revolution in real time. While other works,

---

[1]"Letter, Elisabeth Dmitrieff-Tomanovsky to Hermann Jung," 24 April, 1871, in *Lettres de communards et de militants de la Ire Internationale à Marx, Engels et autres, dans les journées de la Commune de Paris en 1871*, ed. Jules Rocher (Paris: Bureau d'Editions, 1934), 36–37.

[2]"Letter, Elisabeth Dmitrieff-Tomanovsky to Karl Marx," 7 January, 1871, reprinted in Sylvie Braibant, *Elisabeth Dmitrieff: aristocrate et pétroleuses* (Paris, Belfond, 1993), 99–101.

particularly Sylvie Braibant's *Elisabeth Dmitrieff: Aristocrate et Pétroleuses* and Carolyn Eichner's *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune*, examine Dmitrieff solely in the context of her contributions to women's history and feminist socialism's development, this chapter will analyze how she, like other non-French radicals, came to view the Commune as the best means of realizing her political and ideological goals, both within the bounds of Paris and beyond. Particular emphasis will be placed on how her interactions with both French radicals and her fellow foreign revolutionaries contributed to advancing her political beliefs from youthful philosophical inquiry into practical policy and action forged amid the violence and discord of a city under siege. For Dmitrieff, the success of Paris's revolution constituted a first necessary step for a transnational reordering of women's relations to production and the nature of women's work.

The future Mme. Elisabeth Dmitrieff, revolutionary and alleged *pétroleuse*, entered the world as Elisavieta Loukinitchna Koucheleva on November 1, 1850,[3] the third of five children born to a Russian nobleman and a German nurse. Her father, Louka Kouchelev (b. October 28, 1793), came from a family with a high pedigree; his father (Elisabeth's grandfather) served as a special councilor to both Paul I and Alexander I. Indicative of the Kouchelev's standing, the Czar and Czarina attended Louka's baptism.[4] Following a distinguished military career that included participating in the occupation of

[3]Though listed as being born in 1851 by Singer-Lecocq, her major Soviet biographer Knizhnik-Vetrov, as well as Braibant, who worked in the Moscow archives, lists her date of birth as 1850. See Yvonne Singer-Lecocq. *Rouge Elisabeth* (Paris: Editions Stock, 1977); Ivan Knizhnik-Vetrov. *Russkie deiatel'nitsky Pervogo Internatsionala I Parizhskoi Kummuny* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1964); and Sylvie Braibant. *Elisabeth Dmitrieff: Aristocrate et Petroleuse* (Paris: Belfond, 1993).
[4]Braibant, 19–20.

Paris after Napoleon's first abdication in 1814, Louka settled at the family estate in Volok in the Russian Empire's Pskov region. From his 28-room manor house, Louka oversaw hundreds of peasants, still living in serfdom, who worked his fields and knew him as a harsh and, at times, cruel lord. In June 1848, while attending his brother Nicolai's funeral, he met Carolina Dorethea Troskievitch, a nurse from Prussia's Courland region who cared for his brother in his final months. Described by contemporaries as strikingly beautiful, Carolina captivated Louka, despite being twenty years his junior. Carolina returned to Volok with Louka, where she lived as his partner until their official marriage in 1856. Prior to being wed, Carolina gave birth to Elisabeth and four other children (one of whom died at birth), a fact that presented Louka with a serious problem. Given the Russian nobility's conservatism and intense Orthodoxy at the time, formally acknowledging these children as his might taint Louka's family's august name, thus he legally recognized Elisabeth and her siblings as his wards, rather than his heirs. Under Russian law, this allowed them to inherit his wealth but not his noble title, a policy usually employed with bastards. Though Louka's legitimate children, this black mark in the eyes of Russian elite society would greatly complicate much of Elisabeth's early life as she balanced her relative privilege with this social stigma.[5]

After Louka's death on February 13, 1859, their mother, known as Natalia Iegorovna following her conversion to Orthodoxy, was left in charge of the children's education and general upbringing. The problematic status they inherited from their father complicated this to a significant degree, particularly for the Kouchelev girls. While their

[5]Ibid., 24–30; Singer-Lecocq, 39–47; and Carolyn Eichner, *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2004), 27.

brother Vladimir attended an elite academy frequented by the children of the nobility, Elisabeth and her sisters Sophia and Anna found themselves barred from a corresponding girls' school due to their perceived "bastard" status. However, despite this setback, their mother continued Elisabeth and her sisters' education through the use of private tutors. Drawn from throughout Europe, these tutors included a Prussian exile from the 1848 Revolution and a British woman known as "Miss Betsy," both of whom exposed the girls to the most cosmopolitan intellectual currents. The tutor with the greatest influence on Elisabeth's subsequent development, however, was unquestionably the composer Modest Mussorgsky who, as a friend of the family, worked with the Koucheleva girls in early 1862. Influenced by the "new ideas" sweeping through Russia in the wake of Czar Alexander II's emancipation of the serfs, Mussorgsky introduced Elisabeth to current radical literature, including, according to one source, Karl Marx's writings in the journal *Rousskoie Slovo*.[6] While tales of a twelve-year-old Elisabeth reading Marx may be apocryphal, Mussorgsky did present her with a copy of Nikolay Chernyshevsky's *What is To Be Done*. Described as a literary bible for dissatisfied Russian aristocratic youth, the highly controversial novel (it landed Chernyshevsky in a St. Petersburg prison) presented a blueprint, albeit drenched in melodrama, for both cooperative socialism and a path for female liberation.[7] Its heroine, Vera Pavlovna, manages to subvert her family's control, as well as the limitations Russian society placed upon women, by entering into a

[6]Vassili Soukhomline, "Deux femmes Russes combattantes de la Commune," *Cahiers Internationaux* XIV (May 1950), at 55.
[7]Andrew Drozd, *Chernyshevsky's What is To Be Done: A Reevaluation* (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1986), 9–15.

"fictitious marriage" with a like-minded young radical who facilitates her independence.[8] The influence this book exercised on Elisabeth, particularly the model it presented for a woman's emancipation, within a few years made itself readily apparent.

While the radical literature presented by her tutors introduced her to new ideological horizons, Elisabeth's relative isolation in Volok prevented her from interacting with other like-minded young Russians and thus furthering her intellectual development. This, however, was remedied as the Kouchelev family began, in either 1864 or 1865, to spend a portion of the year living in a second residence within St. Petersburg.[9] The family's St. Petersburg home itself presented Elisabeth with new literary offerings, as it contained the portion of her late father's library that focused on "new ideas," with volumes in French, English, German, and Italian that focused on both advances in the natural sciences and the liberal movements of the 1830s and 1840s.[10] While these works furthered Elisabeth's development, the connections she forged with other like-minded young urban aristocrats opened up entire new avenues of thought and discourse.

Drawing from Chernyshevsky, these young intellectuals described themselves as "new people" dedicated to restructuring Russian life in a manner that promoted individual liberty, social equality, and the application of modern scientific principles to governance, as well as rectifying society's ills. Their opponents deemed them *nigilistki* or nihilists, asserting their approach was a mindless, immature rejection of the existing

---

[8]Nikolay Chernyshevsky. *What is to Be Done? Tales About New People* (London: Virago, 1982).
[9]Soukhomline, 54 ,gives Elisabeth's age as fourteen or fifteen when the family began to reside regularly in the city. Knizhnik, 22, asserts it was 1865. Braibant, while indicating the family had visited St. Petersburg regularly beginning in 1862, indicates a part time residence as well in 1864.
[10]Soukhomline, 54.

order. While these young intellectuals, as indicated, engaged in a wide variety of fields, Elisabeth gravitated at this early point toward those circles interested in the question of female liberation. While travelling in these circles, Elisabeth first met Anna Korvin-Krukovskaia, a fellow young radical interested in exploring various means of gaining her emancipation. These early encounters eventually solidified into both a friendship and working relationship that continued in both Geneva and Paris.[11] Along with Chernyshevsky's book, these "liberation" circles also focused on other works that provided a blueprint for young Russian women to escape the patriarchal realities of their time. Stories such as Nedezhda Khvoshchinskaia's "The Boarding-School Girl" and Nadezhda Suslova's "A Story in Letters" presented templates for young Russian women to escape their family's tyranny over their future and realize themselves both personally and intellectually.[12] Given Elisabeth's own complex relationship with the Russian social order, which denied her the educational access given to her brother due to her gender and social standing (while still providing her with relative privilege), it is little wonder she was rapidly drawn into these groups. While participation in these groups introduced Elisabeth to like-minded individuals, it must be noted that few, if any, of these groups engaged deeply with theory; rather, their radicalism found expression in emotionally-driven and intellectually immature critiques of the existing order.

By late 1866, Elisabeth, soon to be seventeen, grew restless in St. Petersburg. Deeply interested in politics and theory, she longed to further her studies in these fields.

---

[11]Richard Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism, 1860–1930* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978), 66–67; and Eichner, 62.

[12]Both Barbara Engel's *Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth Century Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983), 62–86 and Stites's *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia* provide a useful background to these movements. See also Briabant, 48–55.

However, nearly all Russian institutes of higher education barred females from attending, thus travel abroad was her only viable option. However, for a young unmarried woman such an action would certainly lead to scandal and thus was forbidden by her mother. Faced with these limitations, Elisabeth drew inspiration from Chernyshevsky's heroine Vera Pavlovna and sought a "fictitious marriage" with a man who would provide her with the capacity to travel and study without her family suffering catastrophic social consequences. This problem found its solution in Colonel Mikhail Nicolaievitch Tomanovsky, whom Elisabeth met through common social connections in St. Petersburg. Though thirty-three years old to Elisabeth's seventeen, Tomanovsky found himself attracted to the young women's intellect as well as her beauty. For Elisabeth's part, Tomanovsky seemed an ideal candidate for a marriage of liberation; not only was the Colonel interested in "new ideas," but he also suffered from a serious illness, likely tuberculosis that had already forced him to leave his regiment of hussars frequently to allow him to convalesce at his family's Novgorod estate. Both families assented to the match, and the two married in 1867. The match followed the Chernyshevsky model for Elisabeth, thus, in late 1868, the young Mrs. Tomanovsky departed for Geneva to continue her studies with her husband's support and consent.[13]

For the first year and half following her departure from Russia, no record exists of Tomanovsky's activities. While the Soviet sources (Knizhnik-Vetrov), as well as Singer-Lecocq and Eichner, list her as travelling directly to Geneva, no record of her presence in the city exists until mid-1870.[14] Braibant, though agreeing with other scholars regarding

[13]Briabant, 58–60.
[14]See Knizhnik-Vetrov, 47–57; Singer-Lecocq, 89; and Eichner, 62. McClellan, 99, also notes this lapse.

Mrs. Tomanovsky's arrival in Geneva in late 1868, does suggest that she may have made several stops in Germany during her voyage, possibly in Berlin, Leipzig, and Frankfurt.[15] What seems most likely, given the level of prominence Tomanovskaya possessed when first appearing in mid-1870 Internationalist records, is that she first underwent a period of vetting and initial instruction before being accepted fully into the Russian radical expatriate community's ranks. Though active in youthful radical circles in St. Petersburg, Tomanovskaya would encounter a much more sophisticated level of radical thought and discourse that, understandably, required study prior to engagement. Equally important, Tomanovskaya had to initiate contact with connected individuals within Geneva's Russian community who could both provide for her introduction and vouch for her intentions (i.e., give assurances that she was not a Czarist agent). Nearly all sources agree that Tomanovskaya's old St. Petersburg friend Anna Korvin-Krukovskaia, who arrived in Geneva in early 1870, served in this role.

At the time Tomanovskaya and Korvin-Krukovskaia became reacquainted, the latter enjoyed established connections not just among expatriate Russians but also among prominent Internationalists. Having first gone to Paris in 1869, Korvin-Krukovskaia, while working as a typist, became an active participant in several working class organizations. This work introduced her to André Léo and her partner, Internationalist Benoît Malon, both prominent players within Parisian radical circles.[16] Through them Korvin-Krukovskaia met Victor Charles Jaclard, a longtime Blanquist and member of the

[15]Briabant, 62.
[16]Both of whom, particularly Léo, Tomanovsky would work with during the Commune.

International's Paris branch,[17] who soon became her lover and later her husband.[18] Their partnership proved political as well as personal, as Korvin-Krukovskaia actively collaborated with Jaclard in his work for the International. During the Second Empire's crackdown on the International in early 1870 (which netted Malon and his fellow future Communard Leo Frankel), Jaclard, along with Korvin-Krukovskaia, managed to flee to Geneva successfully, where they continued their work for the International. By the time they encountered Tomanovskaya, they enjoyed high regard both among Russian radical expatriates and within the International, with Marx referring to Korvin-Krukovskaia as "a very learned Russian lady" and Jaclard as "an excellent young man."[19] Tomanovskaya's relationship with Korvin-Krukovskaia and Jaclard does much to account for her rapid rise in importance among Geneva's Russian exiles and Internationalists after mid-1870.

1870, the year of Tomanovskaya's emergence in Geneva, marked the end of a highly divisive period for both the city's radical Russian community and its larger population of radical exiles from Germany, France, and elsewhere. Since 1868 the city had been the site of an ideological power struggle between the International's General Council, led by Marx, and Mikhail Bakunin, a Russian revolutionary and collectivist anarchist. The conflict with Bakunin, who joined the International in 1864, began in 1868 when he started organized a new group in Geneva, the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy. This group attracted the majority of Geneva's Russian radicals, as well as others (Korvin-Krukovskaia and Jaclard joined in 1868 prior to their arrival in

---

[17]Paul Lafargue and Charles Longuet, both future sons-in-law of Marx, sponsored Jaclard's admission into the International. Their support was significant given his background with both Blanqui and Bakunin. See McClellan, 100.

[18]Edith Thomas, *The Women Incendiaries* (New York; George Braziller, 1966), 90–91.

[19]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, April 14, 1870," *Collected Works 43,* 478–81.

Geneva) who were told by Bakunin that the Alliance would operate as a section within the International.[20] Marx, however, viewed the situation very differently; asserting that through the Alliance Bakunin "had started a nice little conspiracy against the International, "a plot to place our society under the guidance and supreme initiative of the Russian Bakunin."[21] On December 22, 1868, Marx composed a circular in the General Council's name that declared the Alliance to be in violation of the International's rules and had it secretly distributed to all branches. However, by the summer of 1869, Marx, greatly angered by Bakunin's continued organizing efforts, condemned his efforts as an "extremely reactionary business, fitting for the Pan-Slavists" and once again asserted that he and his Internationalist colleagues must "immediately and publicly quash it (the Alliance) as contrary to the rules."[22]

This growing split between Marx and Bakunin by mid-1869 forced Geneva's Russian radical community to commit themselves to one or the other. While most had joined the Alliance in 1868, by the summer of 1869 many began to drift away from Bakunin toward the Marxist-International position. A Russian-language newspaper, *Narodnoe Delo*, edited by Marx's supporter Nicholas Utin, served as the mouthpiece for this group, asserting that its pro-Marx stance represented the will of Geneva's Russian radicals. By late 1869, the *Narodnoe Delo* was encouraging Russian exiles to leave the Alliance and petition for official status as a Russian Section of the International within

[20]McClellan, 48–49.
[21]"Letter, Karl Marx to Paul and Laura Lafargue, February 15, 1869," *Collected Works 43,* 216–18.
[22]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, July 27, 1869," ibid., 332.

Geneva.[23] On March 24, 1870, Marx, as the representative of the General Council, wrote Geneva's Russian exiles and informed them they had been unanimously accepted as a Section of the International. He ended by extolling them in their actions to honor "your teacher Chernyshevsky" and "prove that your country is also beginning to take part in the movement of our age."[24] However, while this official recognition greatly boosted the Genevan Russian exile community's standing with London (aside from the minority who remained loyal to Bakunin); serious questions remained within the International's leadership regarding the organization's long-term commitment to Marx's ideological views. Nearly all of the new Section's leadership had been Alliance members or worked directly with Bakunin, including even Marx's favorites Korvin-Krukovskaia, Jaclard, and Utin.[25] This situation required the recruitment of new members to Geneva's Russian section, who had been uninvolved with the Alliance or Bakunin and who could represent the group to the General Council without the taint of questionable political associations. It thus comes as little wonder that in the summer of 1870 the young Elisabeth Tomanovskaya began to play a prominent role within the Russian Section.

During the brief period for which records exist, young Tomanovskaya (she would turn eighteen in November of 1868) took to her work for the Russian Section with great vigor. Her active participation at section meetings aided her in refining her understanding of radical and socialist thought. One of her first recorded actions, which

---

[23] McClellan, 56–64. McClellan argues that by November 1869 that the *Narodnoe Delo*'s editor, Utin, and his associates "became a *de facto*, if still unofficial, section of the IWMA."

[24]"The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to Committee Members of the Russian Section in Geneva," in *Documents of the First International: The General Council of the First International, 1868–1870 Minutes* (Moscow; Progress, 1964), 410–11.

[25]Even Marx and Engels' longtime collaborator and friend Johann Becker temporarily fell out of favor due to his work with Bakunin and his Alliance.

deeply endeared her to her Geneva comrades, was to donate 50,000 rubles, her inheritance from her father, to help fund *Narondnoe Delo*.[26] Her linguistic skills, the product of her international tutors, also proved an immense asset to the Russian section in their correspondence with London, the diverse radical community in Geneva, and with other sections in Europe. It appears, in addition to Russian, she spoke and read French and German fluently and also spoke some English. According to Knizhnik-Vetrov, Tomanovskaya joined a section of women workers and began aiding in the organizing of women's cooperatives.[27] Eichner interprets these actions as being representative of Tomanovskaya exercising her already fully actualized ideological views on feminist socialism, combining Marxian thought with Russian populism and feminism.[28] However, based on her limited experience with working class organizing, it seems much more likely that she assisted in these efforts rather than leading them. Her relative inexperience also makes it likely that she undertook these efforts in cooperation with other comrades from the Russian section. Moreover, Tomanovskaya's developing such a sophisticated ideological perspective in such a short time, as Eichner contends, seems unlikely as well. As her later communications with Marx in London indicate, her work with the Russian Section represented a continuation of her political learning process.

While Tomanovskaya broadened her radical horizons in Geneva, events in France began moving toward the true crucible of Tomanovskaya's ideological formation, the Paris Commune. While her participation in Paris as "Elisabeth Dmitrieff" was still months away, she began to develop several contacts within France that tied her to the

[26]Briabant, 68.
[27]Knizhnik-Vetrov, 47–57.
[28]Eichner, 63–64.

tumultuous political process occurring there. After being introduced by Korvin-Krukovskaia and Jaclard, Tomanovskaya began corresponding with Benoît Malon, a prominent figure in the International's Parisian section. The Russian section's contact with Malon began in early 1870 following the Le Creusot strike, and sometime during the summer of 1870, while Malon sat in Saint-Pelagie prison, he and Tomanovskaya began exchanging letters as part of this relationship.[29] Through her relationship with Malon, Tomanovskaya would meet his partner André Léo upon arriving in Paris the following March, who proved an important collaborator (at least initially) in her work organizing the Commune's women. Moreover, it is likely that this network with Malon introduced her to Leo Frankel (a close comrade of Malon's), who would provide vital support within the Communal leadership for her *Union des Femmes.*

Equally important in terms of establishing connections within Paris was the return of her close comrades Anna Korvin-Krukovskaia and Victor Charles Jaclard to the city in September 1870. Arriving only a week after the events of September 4, Jaclard immediately resumed his radical activities, becoming commander of the 158th National Guard battalion based in the heavily working class 18th *Arrondissment*. Anna began working for the 18th *Arrrondissement's* Vigilance Committee, concentrating mainly on raising money to support her husband's unit. Jaclard himself actively participated in the October 31 insurrection against the Provisional Government, leading to his arrest and imprisonment until the Paris Siege ended in January. Following a brief foray to Metz in

[29]Knizhnik-Vetrov, 75–76. As one of Malon's biographers notes, Napoleon III's political prisons were not particularly harsh, and Malon, as well as other prisoners, were able to continue with their political activities while incarcerated. See K. Steven Vincent, *Between Marxism and Anarchism: Benoit Malon and French Reform Socialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 16–19.

February, where Jaclard unsuccessfully ran for the National Assembly, the couple remained in Paris and once again became active following the Revolution of March 18. Though Korvin-Krukovskaia's and Tomanovsky's relationship became strained in the weeks after Tomanovsky's arrival in Paris, her long-standing relationship with the couple would prove advantageous upon her initial arrival in Paris.[30]

While developing these radical networks had later significance, in the fall and early winter of 1870 Tomanovsky's focus still lay on the work of Geneva's Russian section: going to meetings; translating documents for *Narondnoe Delo;* and working with the local women's cooperatives. These activities, coupled with her continued reading of radical literature, furthered her intellectual maturation process. Geneva provided an ideal sanctuary for Tomanovsky during this period of ideological formation. Similar to London during this period, Geneva possessed a liberal government relatively tolerant of radical activities. Of particular import to young female radicals like Tomanovsky, Geneva also presented a site tolerant of women's active presence in the public sphere, a rarity in Europe's highly patriarchal social order.[31]

Though her time in the Swiss city proved fruitful, in December 1870 events presented Tomanovskaya with an opportunity to accelerate her radical development while furthering the interests of Geneva's branch of the International. That month Geneva's Central Council informed Tomanovskaya that she would be travelling to London for two purposes: first, to present the General Council with a report on the Russian section's work and to provide perspective on current developments within Russia itself. Since

[30]Thomas, 89–91; McClellan, 157–58; and Edwards, 84.
[31]Eichner, 63. For more on London's role in relation to émigré and exiled radicals, see Chapter 2.

Marx had agreed to be the Russian section's representative on the General Council, he would be the main recipient of these reports.[32] Second, Geneva's Central Council also charged her with informing London about recent developments within the city, particularly those pertaining to the continued struggle with Bakunin and his supporters. However, this appointment begs an important question: why send a twenty-year-old newcomer to the Internationalist Movement on a mission of such importance? Why not send a more experienced figure, such as Nicholas Utin, who had been operating within Geneva's Russian community and larger radical community for years?

There are several reasons Mrs. Tomanovskaya served as Geneva's representative to London. First, her natural intellect, coupled with her linguistic skills, made her particularly well-suited to present the work of both the Russian Section and the larger Geneva branch. Moreover, both Thomas and McClellan contend that her charm and beauty (the latter describes her as "stylishly frail") also factored into her choice as the Russian section's representative.[33] Eichner argues that the choice is also "indicative of Dmitrieff's (Tomanovsky's) importance within the organization."[34] While the sources certainly indicate that Tomanovskaya's star was rising within the Geneva group, she still lacked the experience that other Russian section members' possessed; thus, additional factors must have played a role in her choice. Here is where her recent joining of the section comes into play; unlike most of its other members, including Utin, she had not participated in the Alliance with Bakunin and thus did not carry the stigma of associating

[32]N. Efremova and N. Invanov. *Russkaia Soratnitsa Marksa* (Moscow: Moskovskii Rabochii, 1982), 70–71; Eichner, 64; and McClellan, 154.
[33]Thomas, 72; and McClellan, 154.
[34]Eichner, 64.

with the man who was rapidly establishing himself as Marx's main ideological opponent within the International movement. The language utilized in the introductory letter the Russian section sent with Tomanovskaya reinforces this assertion. They begin by informing "Citizen Marx" that their "best friend" Elisabeth Tomanovskaya "is sincerely and profoundly devoted to the revolutionary cause of Russia." While this establishment of her radical credentials constitutes standard operating procedure in such letters, the next sentence is telling: "we will be glad if, through her, we will come to know you better, and that at the same time you will understand the circumstances of our activities in more detail, on which she will be able to speak to you."[35] Clearly, "understanding the circumstances of our activities" included the full disclosure of all previous activities involving Bakunin and the section's ardent assurances that all remaining ties had been cleanly severed. Moreover, the "come to know you better" may have, beyond Bakunin, also referenced an earlier misstep with Marx made by the Russian section. In early 1870, Utin and his comrades addressed Marx in a formal letter as a "Dear and venerable Citizen," to which Marx, 52 at the time, took personal umbrage, leading him to write his close colleague Hermann Jung inquiring why these Russians thought him an old man. Though the Russian section quickly apologized,[36] this incident further reinforces Tomanovskaya being chosen as a representative to rehabilitate the Geneva Section's image in the eyes of Marx and the General Council.

Regardless of the reasons for her being chosen, Mrs. Tomanovskaya received a warm reception from the General Council; indeed, Marx, Engels, and Hermann Jung all

[35]Letter, "The Central Committee of the Russian Section to Karl Marx," 9 December, 1870, reproduced in full in Singer-Lecocq, 115.
[36]McClellan, 88.

were impressed and charmed by the young Russian woman. The Marx household shared this positive impression, particularly Marx's beloved daughter Jenny, with whom Tomanovskaya became particularly close during her time in London.[37] Tomanovskaya's only surviving letter to Marx, written on January 7, 1871, demonstrates the personal relationship she developed with both Marx and his daughters, indicating that she spent a great deal of time with the family socially.[38] It further appears that Tomanovskaya, who suffered from poor health, might have spent some time residing at the Marx home while recovering from a bout of bronchitis. Indeed, the closeness of Tomanovskaya's relationship with the Marx family was well-known enough to be utilized by Marx's anarchist opponents, whose later anti-Semitic attacks asserted that Tomanovskaya was a Jewess and "fanatical admirer of Marx" whom he encouraged to venerate him as a "Modern Moses."[39] While these charges have no basis in historical reality (Tomanovskaya was raised Russian Orthodox), it is apparent that Tomanovskaya's charm and intelligence rapidly won her the regard of Marx and his family, a regard that was soon reflected in her expanding work for the General Council.

While her warm relations with the Marx family brightened her time in London, the bulk of Tomanovskaya's time in the British capital focused on study and work. As she was charged by Geneva's Russian Section, Tomanovskaya focused much of her attention on answering Marx and the General Council's questions regarding the current

---

[37]Following the Commune's repression, the Marx family at first feared Tomanovsky dead, leading Jenny to write her parents, "Poor Mrs. Tomanovsky, I fear we have lost her forever." Letter, "Jenny Marx to Karl Marx, June 1871," in Jenny Marx Longuet, Laura Marx Lafargue, and Eleanor Marx Aveling, *The Daughters of Karl Marx: Family Correspondence, 1866–1898*, ed. Olga Meier, trans. Faith Evans (New York : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982), 104.

[38]See page 1.

[39]James Guillaume, *L'Internationale, Doucments et souvenirs (1864–1878).* vol. 2 (Paris: P.V. Stock, 1905), 157–58.

situation in Russia. The post-emancipation rural situation in Russia particularly drew Marx's interests, and in a letter from January 7 Tomanovskaya responded to Marx's questions on the future of communal property held among Russia's former serfs. This letter, given it is the only one from Tomanovskaya to Marx that survives, has been the subject of intense scholarly scrutiny and interpretation. Eichner argues that Tomanovskaya's assertions in this letter "disputed Marx's model of historical progression… (and) posited a Russian exceptionalism, interwoven with an underlying critique of Russian patriarchy," as well as illustrating her "feminist socialist thought" at the time.[40] However, little in Tomanovskaya's letter seems to support such a broad ideological assessment. On the issue of communal property, she simply stated that governmental policy aimed at promoting the evolution of private ownership, thus concluding that "unfortunately it is very probable that it (communal property) will be transformed into small individual properties."[41] This hardly supports Eichner's assessment that Tomanovskaya's letter challenged Marx's dialectic model of development by supporting the commune as a pre-modern alternative to capitalism. Moreover, Eichner's contention that this letter offers a "window" into Tomanovskaya's feminist thought is based on a single line where she states "a law passed last year already abolished communal property in communes with fewer than forty souls (men's souls, since women, unhappily, do not possess souls)."[42] Though clearly a critique of Russian gender norms, this phrase hardly constitutes an articulation of Tomanovskaya's "feminist socialist thought."

---

[40]Eichner, 64–65.
[41]"Letter, Elisabeth Tomanovsky to Karl Marx, January 7, 1870," reproduced in full in Braibant, 99–100.
[42]Ibid.

Rather than providing elements of Tomanovskaya's fully developed ideological positions, the letter of January 7, taken as a whole, presents a young radical still formulating her political positions and thus still highly dependent on the writings and analysis of others. Nearly a quarter of the letter, following her brief assessment of the current state of communal property, focuses on providing Marx with other sources he can consult for a fuller assessment. She suggests that he consult *Narodnoe Delo*, "in which this problem is examined," as well as the 1847 works of the Prussian Baron von Haxthausen, of which she owns "a copy and could send it…immediately." True to her *nigilistki* St. Petersburg roots, she concludes by adding that the last source is particularly valuable, since the great hero of her youth "Chernyshevsky mentions it often and quotes passages from it."[43] While Tomanovskaya does offer a brief analysis of her own, the letter is clearly aimed at providing Marx with the necessary information to further his assessment of conditions within Russia. Given her relative newness to the International, as well as relative inexperience within the radical movement as a whole, Tomanovskaya's role as a research assistant to Marx makes perfect sense. Indeed, her heavy reliance on the works and assessments of others indicates a degree of self-recognition of her limited experience within the radical movement, which in early 1871 was based solely on her studies in St. Petersburg and Geneva, coupled with a limited amount of activist work for Geneva's Russian section.

However, though reflective of her lack of practical experience, Tomanovskaya's letter also demonstrated her remarkable awareness of Russia's current political and social conditions, as well as her engagement with current radical literature. Given she already

[43]Ibid.

possessed such skills at only twenty years old, the members of London's General Council, particularly Marx, could not help but be impressed by this young Russian woman. Indeed, this positive impression soon translated into an opportunity for the young Mrs. Tomanovskaya to convert her radical studies into practice as events in Paris accelerated following its surrender to the Prussians in late January 1871. With the lifting of the Prussian siege, communication reopened with Paris, allowing the General Council's representative to the city, Auguste Serraillier, to return and make a report on February 28. His assessment deeply troubled Marx and the other Council members, highlighting as it did the lack of organization among the Internationalists during the siege, as well as during the February National Assembly elections. While Serraillier praised the work of Leo Frankel and, to a lesser degree, Benoit Malon, his overall assessment of the Parisian Internationalists' performance was quite poor and that, as a result, they had missed several key opportunities to further both the International's interests and those of the French working class as whole. He strongly advised that, since tensions between Paris's population and the recently-elected Versailles Government were increasing daily, it might be wise to dispatch new delegates to the city.[44] Though the Council commended Serraillier for his work, no immediate action was taken.

The Revolution of March 18 and the subsequent foundation of the Commune changed the General Council's view markedly. On March 28, Marx announced that Serraillier had once again been dispatched to Paris, both to serve as the General Council's representative and, prompted by a request from the International's Federal Council in

[44]*Documents of the First International: The General Council of the First International, 187–-1871 Minutes* (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 139–45.

Paris, to aid in guiding that group's policy under the Commune.[45] The General Council initially chose Hermann Jung, Marx's longtime comrade, to travel to Paris as well; however, a recent bout with influenza greatly weakened him and left him unfit to travel. In his place, the General Council chose the young Mrs. Tomanovskaya and charged her with representing the Council and observing and reporting on the Commune. Though clearly lacking Jung's experience, Tomanovskaya possessed several attributes that recommended her for this assignment. Her fluency in French would prove an obvious asset in operating within the French capital, while her equally excellent German could be used in communications with the General Council, as well as with German-speaking Internationalists such as Frankel. Moreover, her existing relationships with several well-connected radicals already within Paris, particularly Korvin-Krukovskaia and Jaclard but also Benoît Malon and his partner André Léo,[46] ensured Tomanovskaya access to prominent radical leaders as well as their networks. Finally, her newness to the International provided her with the advantage of obscurity; whereas the French authorities possessed detailed dossiers on Jung and other leading Internationalists, no records existed of Tomanovskaya's affiliations. To further disguise her origins and purposes, prior to leaving London she adopted the pseudonym Elisabeth Dmitrieff, created by replacing Tomanovskaya with her paternal grandmother's maiden name. As both Eichner and Singer-Lecocq note, Tomanovskaya, in establishing her *nom de guerre*, chose the masculine form of Dmitrieff, rather than the traditional feminine Dmitrieva. Whether this was an action taken wholly for the sake of secrecy or a "revolutionary

[45]Ibid, 163.
[46]Soukhomline, 56.

feminist act…appropriating a male prerogative," as Eichner claims, is unclear.[47] Regardless of the name's origin, Dmitrieff's pseudonym proved effective in protecting her identity (and thus her safety after the Commune's fall). Her police dossier notes that, "it has not been possible to ascertain what the Dmitrieff woman was doing before March 18."[48] To further preserve secrecy, within the minutes of the General Council, Marx and his colleagues would refer to Dmitrieff by the even more obscure title "the Russian Lady."[49]

Armed with this fresh identity, as well as false papers to that effect, the newly minted Madame Dmitrieff crossed the English Channel in late March and arrived in the city on March 28 or 29, with the latter, based on a letter from Jung to Marx, appearing the most likely.[50] She found a city gripped in both excitement and trepidation. Only the day before, Parisian radicals, along with many others, had gathered at the Hôtel de Ville to celebrate the election of the Commune's new representative government, an event characterized by one participant as "a revolutionary and patriotic festive day, peaceful and joyous…worthy of those witnessed by the men of '92."[51] However, the looming confrontation with the recently expelled Government, now residing at Versailles, tempered this enthusiasm to a marked degree. Soon after arriving Dmitrieff contacted Benoît Malon, now a representative of the 17th arrondissement, who was to facilitate her introduction into the city's Internationalist and radical networks over the ensuing days.

---

[47]Eichner, 71; Singer-Lecocq, 128.
[48]Dmitrieff Dossier, *Archive Nationales* BB 24 856.
[49]*Documents of the First International: The General Council of the First International, 1870–1871 Minutes,* 184.
[50]"Letter, Hermann Jung to Karl Marx," March 29, 1871," in *Lettres de communards et de militants de la Ire Internationale*, 16.
[51]*Le Cri du Peuple*, March 30, 1871.

This meeting likely included Dmitrieff's first encounter with Malon's partner André Léo, who encouraged Dmitrieff to join her as a member of the *Comité des Femmes*.[52] This organization, founded during the siege by Proudhonist and 8th Arrondissement Mayor Jules Allix, focused on pressing matters for women such as work and social welfare, but also long-term issues such as education and political rights. Its efforts to train women in first aid to serve as nurses, as well as creating employment centers for women workers, made it very popular during the Siege, allowing it to boast by the March 18 Revolution 160 district subcommittees and nearly 1800 members.[53] Furthermore, the *Comité* made the first attempt in Paris (during the Prussian siege) to create units of women to serve in combat. However, Allix's idea for these so-called "Amazons of the Seine" involved a bizarre scheme of arming women with needles tipped with prussic acid, which unsurprisingly became the subject of humor and scorn.[54] Following the Commune's foundation, the *Comité* focused primarily on promoting educational reform, as well as providing work for women suffering economically in the unstable political environment.

While Dmitrieff initially associated herself with this organization, which counted Léo, her old friend Anna Jaclard, and the "Red Virgin" Louise Michel within its ranks, this affiliation proved short-lived. Less than two weeks separate Dmitrieff's arrival in Paris and the April 11 declaration, which she authored, creating the *Union des Femmes pour la Defense de Paris et les Soins aux Blesses*. Furthermore, when the initial lists of *Union des Femmes* members appeared after April 11, the names Léo, Jaclard, and Michel appear neither in the executive committee nor in the lists from individual *arrondissement*

[52]Knizhnik-Vetrov, 77; Briabant, 114; and McClellan, 155
[53]Thomas, 40–41; and Edwards, 92.
[54]Gay Gullickson, *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Commune* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996), 102.

committees. This strongly indicates a break between Dmitrieff and the Commune's other leading female radicals. Edith Thomas notes this in passing but does not address its possible causes.[55] Eichner, however, offers a potential reason for this break: a combination of Dmitrieff's insistence that the *Union* adopt a "top-down, centralized structure" with her, young and unknown among most Parisian radicals and female activists, positioned as its leader.[56] While this certainly contributed to the break among the Commune's most prominent women, another element likely was at play as well. Dmitrieff, upon her arrival in Paris, began establishing new networks that, due to their ideological implications, created a gulf between her and the female radicals with whom she had previously established associations.

One element that supports this model is the relationship that developed upon Dmitrieff's arrival with Nathalie Lemel, who emerged after the *Union's* establishment as Dmitrieff's closest collaborator and her essential second-in-command. Long established within Parisian radical circles, Lemel, twenty-five years Dmitrieff's senior, arrived in Paris with her husband in the early 1860s. Their work in book-binding led to her involving herself with the labor associations that sprang up during the late Second Empire. Her radicalization led to her to joining the International by 1866. Upon joining, she met Eugène Varlin who, following Lemel's break with her husband over his alcoholism became her partner and lover.[57] Varlin, along with his close collaborator Leo Frankel, constituted the faction within the International's Parisian branch most closely

---

[55]Thomas, 91.
[56]Eichner, 81.
[57]Maurice Dommanget, *Hommes et choses du temps de la Commune, récits et portraits pour servir à l'histoire de la première révolution sociale* (Paris: Éditions d'histoire sociale, 1968), 194–200; and Thomas, 9–10.

aligned with Marx and the General Council. Given that Dmitrieff's presence in Paris was a result of her dispatch by the General Council with whom Varlin and Frankel kept close contact through the Commune, one can conclude that Dmitrieff's and Lemel's connection also brought her into contact with Varlin and Frankel. Indeed, Dmitrieff's subsequent relationship with Frankel further reinforces this view.[58]

This new network placed Dmitrieff in clear ideological opposition to Léo, Michel, and even Jaclard.[59] Though partnered with the prominent Internationalist Malon, Andre Léo had little use for London's General Council and Karl Marx in particular. A feminist first, Léo viewed gender equality as a prerequisite for social revolution. During the Commune she vigorously attacked the Communal Government, the International, and all radical organizations that alienated women by exclusion and thus "found a way to cause half of (their) troops, who asked only to march and fight with them, to be passed over."[60] Léo, beyond viewing the International under Marx and the General Council as a detriment to equality between the sexes, also objected to its model of centralized control. Favoring the decentralized approach to revolution favored by Marx's opponent Bakunin, which she viewed as more inherently democratic, she attacked Marx for establishing himself as the "pontiff of the International Association" with the power to "excommunicate" all who disagreed with his "papal bull."[61] Given Léo's strong views on Marx and centralized organizations, a clash between her and Dmitrieff, Marx's personal choice to represent the General Council in Paris, seems highly likely. Louise

---

[58]See previous chapter.
[59]A discussion of the ideological factions within the Parisian radical movement can be found in Chapter 2, 81–82.
[60]Andre Léo. "La Révolution sans la Femme," in *La Sociale,* May 9, 1871.
[61]"Letter, Andre Léo to Mathilde Roederer," October 21, 1871, quoted in Eichner, 170.

Michel, who first collaborated with Léo during the late Second Empire, shared her disdain for highly centralized political forms and preferred the grassroots networks of the neighborhood vigilance committees and clubs. Moreover, as Edith Thomas notes in her biography, Michel reveled in her celebrated position as the "Red Virgin," which manifested in her virtual need "to bathe in the crowd…she sought attention out everywhere."[62] Given this, it seems highly unlikely that Michel would willingly defer to a newcomer like Dmitrieff, either in terms of leadership among the Commune's women or the corresponding spotlight it yielded.

The breakdown of Dmitrieff's political relationship with Anna Jaclard, her childhood friend and comrade from the Geneva days, appears also to have been a product of a preexisting division within Paris's radical community. During the late Second Empire, Anna's husband Victor, though a member of the International's Paris section, closely identified himself with Louis-Auguste Blanqui and his ideological mission to realize revolution through the seizure of political power. This agenda, promoted within the Paris branch by Jaclard and Emile Duval, drew opposition from Paul Lafargue, Eugene Varlin, Leo Frankel, and others close to Marx and the General Council, though it did not prevent these men from working together in their common opposition to Louis Napoleon's regime.[63] Jaclard's and his future wife Anna's work in Geneva did much to redeem him in the eyes of the General Council and Marx, who, despite his long-standing ideological disdain for Blanqui, expressed his admiration for the young radical.[64]

However, the evidence strongly suggests that, upon Jaclard's return to Paris, he

---

[62]Edith Thomas, *Louise Michel; ou, La velleda de l'anarchie* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971), 188.
[63]Vincent. *Between Marxism and Anarchism*, 16.
[64]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels, 14 April, 1870," *Collected Works 43*, 478.

reestablished his close ties to Blanqui and his faction. His appointment to a National Guard command in the 18th *Arrondissment*, as well as his and Anna's work for that section's Vigilance Committee during the siege, support this argument, as the 18th *Arrondissment* constituted the main Blanquist stronghold within Paris. Moreover, during the October 31, 1870, insurrection against the Government of National Defense, Jaclard clearly identified himself with Blanqui's unsuccessful efforts to seize control at the Hotel de Ville and establish a revolutionary government. This support, as mentioned previously, led to Jaclard's arrest following the failed uprising, placing him on a list dominated by Blanquists.[65] During his imprisonment, Anna remained active in the 18th *Arrondissment* Vigilance Committee, as well as participating heavily in club activities in that district.[66] Following Jaclard's release in January, fellow radicals elected him commander of the XVIIe Légion fédéréé, a National Guard unit made up almost exclusively of Blanqui's supporters. On March 18, Jaclard, "a partisan of direct action" in the Blanquist tradition,[67] urged an immediate march on Versailles, which ultimately did not occur. Standing for election in the 18th *Arrondissment* on March 26, Jaclard fell short of being elected to the Communal Council and then focused his activities on his military duties.[68] While Anna and Jaclard had been in contact with Dmitrieff during this period, she likely did not discover the extent of their relationship with the Blanquist faction until her arrival at the end of March. This growing political gulf between the two childhood friends serves to account, along with Dmitrieff's differences with Léo and

---

[65]See Benoit Malon, *La Troisieme Defaite du Proletariat Francais*, 45–46; Jacques Rougerie, *Paris Libre 1871*, 51–54; and Edwards, 80–85. Edward's, in his Appendix, refers to Jaclard as a "Blanquist," 385.
[66]McClellan, 158.
[67]Ibid.
[68]*Journal Officiel*, March 31, 1871, 107.

Michel, for the vastly different leadership in the *Union des Femmes* when it first appeared in early April as compared to that of the *Comité des Femmes*.

The exact origin of the *Union* prior to the publication of "A Call to the Women Citizens of Paris" on April 11 is unclear, as no records exist of Dmitrieff's actions during that period. However, based on the background of those signing the subsequent documents and those serving later in committee posts for the *Union*, it appears that Dmitrieff, assisted by Natalie Lemel, began recruiting women of working class origin from the vigilance committees and clubs to participate in this new organization. According to Edith Thomas, this represented a departure from the *Comité des Femmes*, whose membership consisted heavily of women who though often politically radical came primarily from bourgeois and petty bourgeois backgrounds.[69] Dmitrieff's success in this regard, given her less than proletarian background, demonstrates her capacity to navigate Paris's working class networks as well as its radical circles, though the support, influence, and knowledge of Natalie Lemel likely contributed as well.

Dmitrieff's personal charisma, which strongly asserted itself during the Commune, also played a role in her organizational efforts. Lissagaray, the Commune's great chronicler, described her as "tall, golden-haired, wonderfully pretty" and displaying in her efforts "unbelievable strength in her noble heart."[70] Even the police reports in her dossier indicate this magnetism, citing her "active disposition" and an elegance similar to the heroine of the Great Revolution, Théroigne de Méricourt.[71] By utilizing both her

[69]Thomas, 74.
[70]P.O. Lissagaray, *Les Huit journées de mai derrière les barricades* (Paris: Éditions d'histoire sociale, 1968), 115.
[71]Dmitrieff Dossier, *Archive Nationales*, BB 24 856 and Thomas, 71.

personal skills and her connections, Dmitrieff by April 11 garnered enough support to issue a proclamation calling upon Paris's women to mobilize in order to further participate in the city's defense.

This proclamation, entitled "A Call to the Women Citizens of Paris," though issued in the name of "a group of Parisian women," almost certainly was authored by Dmitrieff herself.[72] It illustrates how quickly she grasped the necessary nuance needed in crafting an appeal that would resonate with the Parisian masses' diverse ideological views. Portions of the language reflect her background as an Internationalist and devotee of Marx, such as her statement emphasizing that nations throughout Europe are "waiting for our victory to free themselves in their turn" and her harsh attacks on the "tyranny" of the "privileged classes." However, others, particularly on the question of labor's organization are more ambiguous; she writes of how the masses "want to work but...also want the products of our work."[73] This deliberate ambiguity illustrated Dmitrieff's recognition that she needed to appeal beyond Marxist Internationalists, who represented a very small portion of Paris's radicals. The majority of Parisian working class activists and socialists (including many members of the International's French branch) viewed economic reform in the cooperativist terms put forth by Proudhon, Louis Blanc, and even Blanqui.[74] Under this conception, the state would assist workers in the establishment of cooperatives that would allow them to control the fruits of their labor *within* the existing capitalist order. As one Communard newspaper, the *Montagne*, asserted, "socialism does

[72]Eichner, 71; Braibant, 124; and Thomas, 74, all cite Dmitrieff as the author of the document.
[73]"Appel Aux Citoyennes de Paris," *Journal Officiel* April 11, 1871, 225–26.
[74]A reality recognized by her fellow Internationalist Leo Frankel during his work at the Commission of Labor and Exchange. See Chapter 2.

not deny property...on the contrary it affirms the need for individual ownership."[75] While this certainly contrasted with the Marxist views on labor's organization she had favored during her time in Geneva and London, Dmitrieff 's willingness to compromise for the sake of more effective mobilization demonstrates her growing understanding of the differences between ideological study and revolutionary organizing in the face of a crisis.

While the elements aimed at appealing to Parisian radicals' diverse views on organizing labor represent strategic ambiguity on Dmitrieff's part, at other points within the "Call" she departs from her Marxist views outright to mobilize women through the utilization of France's revolutionary legacy. In attempting to gather women to this new organization, Dmitrieff explicitly calls to "the *citoyennes* of Paris, daughters of the women of the Great Revolution, the women that, in the name of the people and justice, marched to Versailles and took Louis XVI as a captive."[76] Obviously, such appeals ran counter to the position posited by Marx in his 1852 *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, in which Marx decried French radicals' tendency "to parody, now 1789, now the revolutionary tradition of 1793–95" by "conjuring up the spirits of the past to their service, borrowing from them names, battle slogans and costumes."[77] Only a few months before, during his "Second Address to the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War," Marx asserted the need for French radicals to avoid "allow[ing] themselves to be deluded by the national *souvenirs* of 1792" and instead "build for the future."[78] As discussed in

---

[75]*La Montagne*, April 9, 1871, quoted in Edwards, 261.
[76]*Journal Officiel,* April 11, 1871, 225.
[77]Karl Marx. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* and Karl Marx in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 594–97.
[78]Karl Marx, "Second Address of the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War," in *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: On the Paris Commune.* (Moscow: Progress, 1971), 46–47.

the previous chapter, Leo Frankel and other Marxist Internationalist permitted themselves at times to be associated with such statements but never made them directly. Clearly, by virtue of her association with Natalie Lemel, as well as the other working class women who rapidly emerged as leaders within the *Union*, Dmitrieff recognized the resonance that such appeals had among female French workers.[79] Moreover, while ideological differences carried great weight within radical intellectual circles (as demonstrated by Dmitrieff's clashes with Leo and Jaclard), in matters of practical organizing to care for the wounded and assist the war effort, Dmitrieff clearly recognized that the importance of ideological purity diminished greatly. Thus, with this first call to organize Paris's working class and radical women, Elisabeth Dmitrieff established her capacity to distinguish what tactics were needed during "on the ground" operations amid crisis from debates and peaceful organizing in St. Petersburg, Geneva, and London.

As directed in the April 11 proclamation's conclusion, interested Parisian women met that evening at 8 PM at le Grand Café de Nations at 79 rue de Temple. A second organizational meeting was held two days later at the municipal building in the *3rd Arrondissement*.[80] These two meetings marked the official birth of the *Union des Femmes pour la Defense de Paris et les Soins aux Blessés*, which, under Dmitrieff's leadership rapidly grew into the Paris Commune's most important and influential

---

[79]Martin Johnson, in his work *The Paradise of Association: Political Culture and Popular Organizations in the Paris Commune of 1871* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996) argues that an attempt by Parisian women during the unsuccessful sortie against Versailles on April 3 actually marked the beginning of the *Union* and that the references to the Great Revolution in the "Call" only serve to demonstrate "that the historical memory of the revolutionary past was vital for legitimating women's collective action." Eichner, correctly in this author's interpretation, dismisses Johnson's claim as over simplifying the different elements that Dmitrieff utilized in the "Call" to rally Parisian women to the *Union des Femmes.* See Johnson, 243–48; and Eichner, 71–72.

[80]*Journal Officiel*, April 11, 1871, 226.

women's organization. The name itself that this organization adopted provides, like the April 11 "Call," important clues as to why Dmitrieff's *Union* functioned so successfully as a mobilizing force in Paris. By design, potentially polarizing political language and labels were omitted. Though Dmitrieff explicitly stated in her notes that she intended all *Union* members to be obligated to join the International Workingmen's Association and pay dues, no mention of the International appears in the organization's title.[81] Other words utilized by similar organizations during the Commune, such as "revolutionary" and "socialist," are absent as well. Rather, the name emphasizes the city's defense and the care of the wounded, causes capable of drawing women from the broadest possible political spectrum.

This relatively politically neutral title mirrors the language utilized by Dmitrieff in the April 11 "Call," demonstrating again an understanding on Dmitrieff's part as to what language resonated with both ideological and non-ideological Parisian women. Obviously Dmitrieff and most of her fellow *Union* members envisioned a far more sweeping role for their organization than simply caring for the wounded and other traditional "women's" work (as their subsequent efforts illustrate); however, Dmitrieff recognized that women did not constitute the only audience interested in the organization. The *Union*'s title also served to disarm potential anti-feminist sentiment on the part of their male Communard comrades, many of whom possessed strong views on women's roles. An organization whose name indicated a challenge to existing gender norms likely would encounter resistance; however, a group that, in the words of a radical newspaper,

[81]Elisabeth Dmitrieff. "Notes: Travail des Femmes," quoted in Eichner, 86. The *Union*'s relationship with the International is discussed in greater detail later in the chapter.

constituted "a responsible organization among the *citoyennes* of Paris" founded "to give assistance in the work of the government's commissions and to serve at ambulance stations (and) at canteens" faced a much lower likelihood of male opposition.[82] While Dmitrieff's experiences in Russia and Geneva made her painfully familiar with her male comrades' gendered views, she clearly benefited from her exchanges with Lemel and other radical Parisian women in creating a name capable of both mobilizing women and negotiating the chauvinism of radical Frenchmen.

The *Union's* April 14 appeal to the Commune's Executive Commission further underscores Dmitrieff's capacity to navigate the complex interaction between politics and gender under the Commune. This document, authored by Dmitrieff and signed by her as well as seven women workers, constituted the *Union*'s first formal request for aid, support, and recognition by the Commune's government. As with the *Union*'s organizational title, this appeal adroitly framed its request in terms of aiding the city's defense, stating "union makes strength; in time of danger all individual efforts must combine to form a collective, invincible resistance by the whole population."[83] More importantly, Dmitrieff included in this official request a cleverly crafted but explicit statement that the Commune also recognized that universal equality constituted one of the main principles for which it strove. Rather than frame this as a rights-based demand, Dmitrieff explicitly ties her appeal for gender equality to the general call for the destruction of all distinction, including that of class. She asserts that "the Commune, representing the principle of extinction of all privilege and all inequality, should therefore

[82]Quoted in Thomas, 75.
[83]"Adresse des Citoyennes a la Commission Executive de la Commune de Paris," *Journal Officiel* April 14, 1871, 260.

consider all grievances of any portion of the people without discrimination of sex, since such discrimination having…been enforced as a means of maintaining the privileges of the ruling class."[84] She further contends that ALL Parisians possessed a vested interest in aiding the Commune's success, since "ensuring the rule of justice and labor is of as much importance to women as it is to Paris's men."[85]

Both the approach and tone of the April 14 "Address" to the Commune's Executive Commission indicate a document constructed with great care and awareness of audience. While Dmitrieff crafted the April 11 "Call" and the *Union's* name to appeal to the general Parisian pro-Commune population, the "Address" was aimed at a body of specific individuals: the seven man Executive Committee as well as the general Communal body. Given that Dmitrieff arrived in Paris only two weeks before, her fellow *Union* members' aid, particularly Natalie Lemel's, likely proved essential in properly nuancing this petition. Indeed, it is impossible to imagine that Dmitrieff could have achieved so much so quickly without her connection with Lemel, who, as Eichner notes, "had work, union, and strike experience," as well as many long-standing personal connections with members of both the Communal leadership and prominent individuals within Paris's radical female community.[86] In addition to Lemel, of the seven women who also signed the April 14 "Address," two, Aline Jarry and Blanche Lefevre, also possessed established credentials within Parisian radical circles. While our knowledge of their overall activities is limited, Jarry worked in the late 1860s with Andre Léo in her feminist organizing, thus indicating she possessed working knowledge of Paris's radical

[84]Ibid.
[85]Ibid.
[86]Eichner, 81.

networks. Lefevre established a reputation during the siege as a popular speaker in the clubs where other prominent Parisian radicals also participated frequently.[87] These French women, as well as unnamed others, interacted regularly with the men who now constituted the Commune's leadership, thus allowing Dmitrieff by virtue of her growing connections to these women to shape the April 14 "Address" in the manner most likely to yield success.

Aided by these female comrades, the document Dmitrieff produced illustrates an acute awareness of the dominant currents regarding gender among the Commune's leadership. As noted above, the *Union* framed its April 14 request in terms of aiding Paris's defense and undercutting the system of privilege previously perpetrated by France's ruling class. Direct calls for female suffrage and citizenship rights are avoided; rather the emphasis is placed on universal equality in the name of class solidarity. While the *Union* soon shifted its emphasis to demanding economic justice for Paris's women, this initially cautious approach demonstrates Dmitrieff and her comrades' understanding of the powerful influence that Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's ideas still enjoyed within Parisian radical circles. As Robert Tombs aptly observes, "Proudhon's influence saturated Communard socialism,"[88] and while this most often manifested itself in approaches to labor organization and economics, Proudhon's ideas regarding women still carried great influence as well. Proudhon's general misogyny permeated most of his works, epitomized by such statements as "Man and woman are not companions…consequently, far from advocating what is now called the emancipation of

[87]Paul Fontoulieu, *Les églises de Paris sous la Commune* (Paris: Dentu, 1873), 225; and Eugene Schulkind, "Socialist Women during the Paris Commune," *Past and Present* 106 (February 1985): 124-163, at 152–54.
[88]Tombs, 118.

woman, I should incline, rather, if there were no other alternative, to exclude her from society."[89]

Proudhon and his followers strongly opposed women's participation in both political activism and work outside the home, though beyond the factory floor most male French radicals rejected Proudhon's militant misogyny and did support free education for girls as well as boys. Proudhon's ideas strongly influenced Parisian radical politics throughout the 1860s, including within the International's French branch. In 1866, the French delegates in the International's Geneva Conference signed a joint declaration that deemed women's participation in industrial work as "one of the most pressing causes of the degeneration of the species."[90] Henri Tolain, a founder of the French branch, asserted that women working outside the home contributed to female prostitution. Though by the time of the Commune the International's French branch included some members, particularly Frankel, Varlin, and Malon, who supported women's active inclusion in radical activism and advocated for them in the workforce, the Proudhon view still carried significant weight.[91] Though other factions within the Communal Government, particularly the neo-Jacobins and Blanquists, did not overtly express similar views, several of their actions, particularly their eventual banning of women from the battlefield on May 1, indicate, as Eichner notes, a significant degree of sexism.[92] Given these realities, Dmitrieff's emphasis on the need for unity across gender lines and her framing

---

[89]Pierre Joseph Proudhon, *What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government* (New York: Dover, 1970), 246.
[90]Quoted in Vincent, 15.
[91]On Tolain see Edith Thomas, "The Woman of the Commune," *The Massachusetts Review* 12, no. 3 (Summer, 1971): 410–12. For the General Council position on Proudhon, see August Nimtz, *Marx and Engels: Their Contribution to the Democratic Breakthrough* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 200), 199–201.
[92]Eichner, 103.

of gender inequality in class terms represents a clear attempt to assure the Communal Government's support in a manner that forestalled any objection based on existing ideological gender biases. This approach proved successful and the Executive Council provided the *Union* with rooms in each *Arrondissment* municipal building for offices, as well as providing funding for printing expenses. Thus granted *de facto* official recognition, Dmitrieff and her comrades began establishing institutions to facilitate the managing and running of their new *Union*. For Dmitrieff, this process would present new opportunities and challenges in actualizing her ideological conceptions amid a Paris facing the realities of a new siege.

While gaining the Commune's support certainly aided Dmitrieff in her efforts, managing the *Union* also required the establishment of administrative and organizational structures capable of successfully operating in a Paris under growing military and economic pressure. To this end, Dmitrieff employed an approach that combined her previous experiences in the International with elements geared to meet the specific needs of Paris's female population. Without question, the basic organizational model drew heavily on that utilized by the International. Several scholars, combining these similarities with Dmitrieff's statement regarding requiring *Union* members to join the International as well, conclude that the *Union des Femmes* "was actually the women's section of the French International."[93] These scholars also cite statements made by Benoit Malon as evidence of this direct tie; however, Malon's commentary only implies an understandably close relationship based on Dmitrieff's and Lemel's Internationalist

[93]Thomas, 70. Edwards, 266 agrees, though he sites Thomas as his source.

background.[94] Though Dmitrieff likely intended an eventual official status as a section of the French branch, particularly given the potential which an influx of women presented for further diluting the Proudhonian tendencies of some male members, no evidence exists of the *Union* joining in an official capacity.[95] Further, creating an explicit tie, at least at the onset, between the *Union* and the International ran counter to the inclusive language Dmitrieff and her comrades employed in both the April 11 "Call" and the April 14 "Address."

Regardless of official ties, the *Union des Femmes*' organizational model, shaped in large part by Dmitrieff and Lemel, mirrored that of the International, particularly with its emphasis on federalism. The *Union's* administrative plan, first published in *La Sociale* on April 20, created a two-tier system operating first at the *Arrondissement* level and then at the city-wide level through the auspices of a Central Committee. This Central Committee, according to Article 1, consisted of a representative from each *Arrondissement* (twenty in all) elected by their membership and subject to recall at any time. Replicated at the local level, the *Union* established the same structure in each *Arrondissement* section, with each consisting of eleven elected members headed by a rotating president. At both levels, official committee meetings were to be held twice daily; however, Article 3 asserts that both the Central Committee and the *Arrondissement* offices must remain open "day and night."[96] This emphasis on permanent operation reflects the multifaceted role Dmitrieff envisioned for the *Union*. Foremost in

---

[94]Malon, 274–75.
[95]Eichner, 86. Schulkind also remarks on the lack of evidence of any direct ties in Schulkind, "Socialist Women," 145.
[96]"Administration du comité central de l'Union des femmes pour la défense de Paris et les soins aux blessés," *La Sociale* April 20, 1871.

Dmitrieff's emphasis on keeping the *Union* in constant operation was serving in the Commune's war effort: providing care for the wounded; producing vital war materials; and, if needed, playing a direct role in the fighting. While it was not emphasized in the *Union*'s earlier statements, Dmitrieff clearly viewed the *Union* as playing a potential military role. Article 14 states that funds not used for charity and administrative purposes be set aside to "purchase kerosene and arms for *citoyennes* who will fight should the moment arise."[97] While earlier organizations, particularly Allix's "Amazons of the Seine" envisioned a combat role for Parisian women, Dmitrieff (who likely was aware of the derision that had met Allix's plan) took a much more realistic approach, not presenting grandiose images of women armed with poison needles but rather gathering necessary arms and equipment for an eventuality that she deemed rather likely. This not only further demonstrates her growing understanding of operating within Paris but also shows that, in a relatively short period of time, she came to grasp the dire military situation facing the Commune.

Dmitrieff's understanding of the military crisis came from several sources, indicating once again the importance of her expanding network within Paris. One likely source of her knowledge was her growing contact with key Communard military leaders. In her letter to Hermann Jung on April 24, she prominently mentions her interactions with Jaroslav Dombrowski, a Polish officer considered by many the Commune's most brilliant military leader. Though she compliments Dombrowski's brave efforts, Dmitrieff gloomily relates, based on the information he passed on, that she possesses "no illusions" regarding the Commune's situation and that they "are expecting a general attack" any

[97]Ibid.

day. She then engages in an extended denunciation of General Gustave-Paul Cluseret, a French military adventurer serving as the Commune's commander-in-chief. Dombrowski despised Cluseret, viewing him as a dandy and fool, and thus actively conspired for his removal. Clearly Dombrowski presented this assessment to Dmitrieff, which influenced her greatly, leading her to conclude to Jung that, due to military incompetence, "one of these days Cluseret will be arrested."[98] Dmitrieff's access to Dombrowski, as well as other Communard leaders well apprised of the military situation (such as Frankel and Malon), provided one source of valuable military information necessary for the *Union* to prepare accordingly.

While military commanders proved an important source for Dmitrieff in developing the *Union*'s administrative and military policies, her fellow *Union* members' experiences likely played an equally vital role in shaping her planning efforts. Since the events of March 18, radical Parisian women operated as both actors and spectators to most military actions within and without the city. Of particular importance to understanding the potentially dire military picture were the experiences and observations of Parisian women during the so-called "Great Sortie" on April 3. Prompted by internal pressure, the Communal government assented to allowing the National Guard to make a direct march on Versailles aimed at forcing Thiers and the National Assembly to recognize the Commune's legitimacy. Inspired by this effort, a proclamation appeared on both street corners and in radical newspapers calling for Parisian women to march as well on Versailles on April 3. The call from "*Une Véritable Citoyenne*" invoked the tradition

[98]"Letter, Elisabeth Dmitrieff-Tomanovsky to Hermann Jung, 24 April, 1871," in *Lettres de communards,* 36–37. An assessment of Dombrowski's military skills appears on Edwards, 382. Cluseret was removed from his post by the Communal Council on May 1.

of 1789 and called upon Parisian women once again to march on Versailles, this time to "tell Versailles that the (National) Assembly is not the law: Paris is."[99] Thus on April 3, as the National Guard began its march, Parisian women gathered at the Place de la Concorde where they made ready to begin their own march on Versailles. The American Ambassador Elihu Washburne, no friend of the Commune, described the women's demonstration as follows: "Many of them wore the '*bonnet rouge*,' and all were singing the Marseillaise" as they marched "in poor imitation of those who marched upon the same place in the time of Louis the Sixteenth."[100]

However, as they arrived at Paris's gate, they encountered the flotsam and jetsam of the "Great Sortie." The effort, due to its lack of organization and proper military planning, had been easily crushed by the French regulars with great losses. As one of the marchers described, "there were not enough of us to go to Versailles but there were enough to go tend the injured in the Commune's marching companies."[101] This experience alerted many radical Parisian women to the Commune's precarious military situation and the urgent need for greater preparation, as demonstrated in the ensuing days following April 3 as groups of women walked the streets remonstrating with men they discovered not in uniform.[102] While there is no direct evidence, it seems highly probable that a significant number of these women later joined the *Union* and thus conveyed their observations regarding the Commune's limited capacities in the field to Dmitrieff and

---

[99]"Une Véritable Citoyenne," *Le Cri du Peuple*, April 4, 1871. Also reproduced in part in Thomas 57–58.
[100]Elihu Benjamin Washburne, *Recollections of a Minister to France: 1869–1877* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1887), 142.
[101]Louise Michel, *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel*, ed. and trans. Bullitt Lowry and Elisabeth Gunter (Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1981), 65. For a description of the failed April 3 attack, see Edwards, 198–200; and Horne, 309–11.
[102]Thomas, 59.

other *Union* leaders. This information provided to Dmitrieff by means of her growing network within the *Union*, coupled with her connections with the Commune's military leadership, allowed her to make educated judgments regarding the necessity of the *Union* preparing for a military role. The twenty-four hour schedule at all *Union* offices, coupled with the gathering of arms and incendiary weapons, illustrates just what types of preparations would be necessary to play a role in the city's defense.

Providing for the *Union's* potential military role presents only one example of Dmitrieff's thinking regarding the defense of the city in mid to late April. While creating the administrative basis for the *Union des Femmes*, Dmitrieff also began actively working to assure that the *Union* stood as the unquestioned dominant body in terms of organizing the women of the Commune. These efforts led her into direct and public conflict with her former associate André Léo and her longtime friend Anna Jaclard. Though the ideological gulf between Léo, Jaclard, and Dmitrieff likely contributed to their exclusion from any leadership role in the *Union des Femmes*, there had been no open break between the women. This, however, changed on April 22, when a proclamation appeared from the Montmartre Vigilance Committee calling for Parisian women to "make themselves available to the Commune to form ambulance stations to follow troops engaged with the enemy."[103] This proclamation included the signatures of André Léo, Anna Jaclard, and Louise Michel, as well as several other women who had been prominent *Comité des Femmes* members. The Montmartre Vigilance Committee served a similar function to the *Union*: providing for wounded soldiers; establishing sources of aid for impoverished soldiers' wives; and sending petitions for aid to the

[103]"Avis du Comité de Vigilance des Femmes de Montmartre," *Le Cri du Peuple*, April 26, 1871.

Communal Council. In short, it served the same essential functions as the *Union* itself.[104] Dmitrieff, who saw the *Union* as the sole representative of the women of the Commune, greatly resented this action, as indicated by her response. Several days after the Vigilance Committee's proclamation, the *Union* responded in several newspapers, claiming that André Léo "declared she had no official connection with the…Vigilance Committee" that was "alien to our union." This statement further declared that she had "attested to her desire" to remain an active member of the *Union*'s 10th *Arrondissement* Committee.[105]

This statement by the *Union* is interesting for several reasons. First, there exists no record of André Léo serving on the 10th *Arrondissment* Committee and very little evidence of her participation in the *Union des Femmes* in any capacity.[106] This calls into question whether Léo actually made any of the statements the *Union* claimed in their rebuttal to the Vigilance Committee. Unfortunately there exist no other documents or accounts relevant to this incident on the part of Léo, Dmitrieff, or any other figure. However, the vigor of the *Union*'s response, which could not have been made without Dmitrieff's order, demonstrates a belief on the part of Dmitrieff that she now possessed the capacity and standing to challenge even the most prominent and established women within the Parisian radical movement. Dmitrieff's meteoric rise since her arrival in Paris less than a month earlier to the pinnacle of leadership among the Commune's women can

---

[104]Thomas, 92.
[105]*Le Cri due Peuple*, May 2, 1871. Reproduced in Thomas, 91; and Eichner, 81.
[106]Thomas, 92, claims that there is no evidence that André Léo officially joined the *Union des Femmes* at all. Eichner, cites on source that Léo's, as well as Jaclard's, names appear on a list from the 18th *Arrondissement*; however, she holds that their participation may have existed only on paper. See Eichner, 81.

be attributed in part to her organizational skills and vigor. Yet, the real source of her growing authority stemmed from her ability to establish key connections within the Parisian radical community. Her ability to gain official recognition by the Communal Council rapidly presents one example of this capacity. Yet, her connections with other Internationalists, particularly Leo Frankel and Benoît Malon,[107] ultimately proved vital to the *Union*'s position as preeminent among the Commune's female organizations. The close collaboration between Dmitrieff, Frankel, and Malon on the *Union*'s labor platform would effectively demonstrate the fruits of this association.

Beyond the issues of caring for the wounded and defensive preparations, Dmitrieff's *Union des Femmes* focused extensive attention during its brief existence on the question of women's labor and economic concerns. The measures taken by the *Union* under Dmitrieff's leadership, while addressing the *longue durée* restructuring of labor relations in terms of gender and class, also focused extensively on addressing the immediate economic crisis facing many working class Parisian women and their families. Four months of siege by the Prussians followed by a renewed siege by the Versailles Government left the Parisian economy in absolute disarray. Many businesses and shops closed as their owners abandoned the city in the wake of the March 18 Revolution. The resulting spike in unemployment disproportionately affected Paris's working class. The burden fell even more heavily on Parisian working women, who lacked the option of serving in the National Guard, which provided men with 30 sous a day subsidy for their

[107]Léo's romantic relationship with Malon, which had begun in 1868 and eventually produced two children, appears not to have been a factor in Malon's relationship with Dmitrieff. According Malon's biographer K. Steven Vincent, the two often held contrary political views while maintaining their relationship until their separation in 1878. See Vincent, 42–45.

service.[108] However, within working class family economies, the National Guard pay alone failed to meet even the most basic needs. Hence working class women turned to the Commune seeking employment. Given the military situation, many appealed for work in war industries: producing munitions; sewing uniforms; and providing other essential services for the war effort in exchange for compensation. However, the complex relationship between the Communal Government and the city economy made this situation difficult, at least initially. While cooperatives immediately sprang up in response to the demand for military supplies, the Commune insisted that contracts be accepted on a competitive basis. Several sources relate that those contractors still operating in Paris following the Commune's declaration universally lowered wages, citing the economic crisis prompted by political instability. As a result, they could produce military supplies for much lower costs to the Commune than the worker-run associations. For instance, the Monteux-Bernard textile factory sold the Commune jackets for 3.75 francs and trousers for 2.50. In comparison, worker-run cooperatives, in order to provide their members with a living wage, could sell the same items for no less than 6 francs a piece.[109] This disparity fell particularly on Parisian women, who had long predominated in the so-called "needle trades" and thus became the focus of Dmitrieff and the *Union des Femmes.*

Prompted both by this immediate crisis and the larger goal of reshaping productive relations, Dmitrieff composed an appeal on behalf of the *Union* to the

[108]Horne, 96.
[109]Thomas, 79–80.

Commission of Labor and Exchange.[110] Like earlier documents composed by Dmitrieff on behalf of the *Union*, this appeal demonstrates a keen understanding of the need to balance ideology and practicality gained through a continually developing awareness of the Parisian radical milieu's internal dynamics. This is illustrated by Dmitrieff's marked awareness of audience in her drafting of this document. While her earlier public proclamations, such as the April 11 "Call," largely employed general appeals to equality and the legacy of the Great Revolution, this document, addressed to a Commission controlled by fellow Internationalists Leo Frankel and Benoît Malon, is much more ideological in nature. In calling for the establishment of "free producer associations," Dmitrieff utilizes a language that is clearly Marxian, asserting that creating these associations "would put an end to the exploitation and enslavement of Labor by Capital."[111] Continuing this theme, she evokes Marx's conceptions of immiseration and alienation in justifying why the creation of these associations would provide an immediate material benefit. Further appealing to Frankel's and Malon's Internationalist sensibilities, Dmitrieff asserts that these associations in time would establish international networks, based around each trade, aimed at "centralizing the international interests of the producers," largely through requiring all association participants to become members of the International Working Men's Association.[112]

---

[110]The exact date this appeal was written is unknown but it was likely composed in late April or very early May. In her Letter to Jung on April 24, 1871, she mentions her economics proposals and notes that "we are getting in touch with the government and I think the project will succeed."

[111]Elisabeth Dmitrieff, "Addresse a la Commission de Travail et d'Échange," reproduced in full in Braibant, 140–42.

[112]Ibid.

However, while Dmitrieff employs clear elements of Internationalist discourse in this appeal, she balances these ideological elements with more pragmatic justifications for the creation of these associations and carefully avoids overt arguments based on a gendered conception of rights. Aware that while Frankel and Malon constituted two of the most ardent supporters of women's rights within the Commune's government, this appeal would also be seen by other sets of less enlightened eyes at both the Commission of Labor and Exchange and within the Communal Council. To account for this, Dmitrieff, as in her earlier correspondence with the Commune's government, frames her demand for greater economic rights for Parisian women in class terms, proclaiming that these associations aimed to end "all competition between male and female workers," given that "their interests are identical and their solidarity is essential to the success of the final world-wide strike of labor against capital."[113] Furthermore, she calls for the establishment of these cooperatives primarily in those crafts dominated by women, providing a list of twenty-seven fields heavily concentrated in the "needle trades." Similarly pragmatic, she presents this appeal for women's producer associations as addressing the immediate economic crisis facing the Commune. She contends that "with poverty increasing at an alarming rate," Parisian women, "who have become momentarily revolutionary in spirit," may "relapse into the more or less reactionary and passive position which the social order of the past marked out for them."[114] Thus, Dmitrieff contends, this economic crisis constitutes not just an issue of women's labor but one that could potentially undercut the overall political support for the Commune

[113]Ibid.
[114]Ibid.

itself. Further asserting this economic and political pragmatism, Dmitrieff assures the Commission that the immediate concern of these women's associations upon their inception would be war production. Given the depressed nature of Parisian industry overall, she, like most of her *Union* comrades and Parisian working women in general, understood that providing for the National Guard's needs represented the only major booming aspect of the city's economy. With these points, Dmitrieff managed within this document to balance her Internationalist ideology with arguments framed to appeal to the radicals of other political stripes within the Communal government.

While Dmitrieff's proposal placed emphasis on using these producer associations to meet immediate needs, she also included broader, long-range plans to organize women's work on a permanent basis. However, she, like her fellow Internationalist Leo Frankel, understood that the Communal Government, with its diverse ideological elements, contained a majority opposed to any outright attack on the capitalist mode of production. Ample evidence exists to support this state of affairs, beginning with the Communal Government's refusal to seize the assets of the Bank of France and, as a result, its dependence on that institution's line of credit to pay soldiers and remain solvent.[115] In terms of production, the Communal Government, as discussed above, granted no competitive advantage to worker's associations prior to May 12, little more than ten days prior to the entry of the French Army into Paris.

[115]Edwards, 250–52. Marx greatly mourned the failure of the Commune to act against the Bank, arguing that seizing its assets would have brought the Versailles Government to its knees much more easily than any military measure. "Letter, Karl Marx to Domela Nieuwenhuis, February 22, 1881," in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works 46*, 42.

Recognizing this reality, Dmitrieff's proposal to the Labor and Exchange Commission represented an ideological compromise on her part, envisioning a long-term restructuring of women's work within the bounds of capitalist competition. Financing these women's worker associations presents one example of this. Dmitrieff recognized that government support would be necessary given the very low likelihood that these cooperative institutions would be given loans or credits from private institutions. However, rather than a direct subsidy, Dmitrieff, aiming to avoid opposition within the Communal Government, proposed that the state provide low interest loans for establishing these cooperatives. Furthermore, in her proposed organization plan, she assured the Commission and the Communal Government a good return on their investment. She maintained that, unlike the National Workshops created during the 1848 Revolution, which left women engaged in "futile and unproductive work," these new women's cooperatives would take measures "to have marketable objects produced which have immediate value and are easily sold."[116] Informed by her immersion in Parisian radical politics, Dmitrieff realized that while her Internationalist ideological background rejected the idea of workers being forced to compete within a capitalist structure, the reality of the situation called for compromise in order to achieve the best possible outcome for Paris's working women.[117]

The results of Dmitrieff's nuanced appeal to the Commission of Labor and Exchange appear mixed. While Frankel and Malon began providing financial support to

---

[116]"Addresse a la Commission"

[117]Eichner, 92–93, similarly emphasizes the difficulty faced by the *Union des Femmes* economic program operating with the Commune's still largely capitalist structure, albeit within the framework of the compromises that this forced Dmitrieff to make in terms of her "feminist Socialism," rather than in terms of her Internationalist background.

the *Union* by the first days of May, neither the Commune nor the Commission took immediate action to facilitate the project of establishing women's cooperatives. This can be credited in part to continued resistance by some within the Commune's government to supporting a project that potentially provided for women's permanent removal from the home. For many Communards, particularly those of the Proudhonian bent, the creation of the social republic offered the potential for the "single bread earner model," allowing male workers to be paid enough to consign their wives and daughters to the domestic sphere permanently. Indeed, at a meeting on May 7 of the Commune, even Frankel appeared to make concessions to the Proudhonian model, stating that these government-supported women's cooperatives "would hand out work…the women would be given work to do at home."[118]

However, at the same time the Commission of Labor and Exchange, as directed by Frankel and Malon, undertook a study beginning on May 4 to look into the issue of the distribution of military contracts raised by Dmitrieff and the *Union*, as well as other labor organizations within the Commune. Discussing the conclusions of this report on May 12, Frankel allowed that given the continued practice by private contractors of offering low bids through slashing workers' wages, "we recognize that the workers' co-operative associations cannot at present compete with private industry and they will never be able to do so without the government's support."[119] Thus, he proposes that, to redress this inequality, the Commission of Labor and Exchange be granted authority to award all possible future contracts for military supplies to the workers' associations, including

[118]*Journal Officiel*, May 7, 1871, 487.
[119]*Proces-Verbaux de la Commune.* vol. II, 354.

those being established by the *Union des Femmes*. However, this measure, seemingly a clear victory for the women's associations being established by Dmitrieff as well as workers' cooperatives in general, soon ran into opposition as being too sweeping. Victor Clément, an Internationalist still heavily influenced by the Proudhon tradition, argued that an exemption must be made for existing contracts. With the inclusion of this provision, the attempt to redress the inequality in terms of military contracts was greatly weakened.[120]

While the Commission of Labor and Exchange proved incapable of pressuring the Commune to support workers' associations fully, its actions still established it as Dmitrieff's and the *Union*'*s* greatest ally within the Communal Government. The political and economic support the Commission afforded the *Union* can be credited in large part to the relationship between Dmitrieff and the Commission's heads Leo Frankel and Benoît Malon. Dmitrieff's initial introduction to Malon has already been discussed in relation to her (brief) association with Andre Léo. However, the degree to which Dmitrieff successfully collaborated with these men, particularly Frankel, denotes a multifaceted connection, a product of ideological overlap as well as a common network stretching back to London. As discussed in reference to Dmitrieff's address to the Commission of Labor and Exchange, the three shared a common bond as Internationalists within a Commune where Internationalists constituted a minority. In Carolyn Eichner's analysis, this basic connection, coupled with the fact that "Dmitrieff and Frankel shared a commonality of interest" in terms of labor reform, accounts for the success of the

[120]Ibid, 367. Also discussed by Eichner, 92.

collaboration.[121] While ample for Eichner's study of Dmitrieff as a socialist feminist, this leaves unexamined the role played by the common network tying Dmitrieff, Frankel, and to a lesser degree Malon back to London, the General Council, and Marx. In the previous chapter, Frankel's relationship with Marx and his position as the most prominent "Marxist" among the International's French section is discussed at length, just as Dmitrieff's close relationship with Marx and the London Council is discussed above.[122] However, given the importance of the collaboration between Dmitrieff and Frankel in terms of the former's work for the *Union*, it is necessary to examine briefly the relationship the two established during the Commune's short tenure.

That Dmitrieff and Frankel (as well as Malon) interacted as Internationalists and representatives of the London Council's interests, in addition to their collaboration as head of the *Union des Femmes* and heads of the Commission of Labor and Exchanges, is established through several sources. In Dmitrieff's April 24 Letter to Hermann Jung, she sends along the regards of both Frankel and Malon, relating that their work at the Commission of Labor and Exchange is keeping both men very occupied.[123] In addition to this direct mention of their interaction, the same letter talks of the efforts of another Internationalist, Auguste Serraillier, whom she knew from her time in London and who also likely accompanied her when she arrived in Paris at the end of March.[124] Serraillier, who served as a representative of the International's General Council, worked actively with Frankel and Malon on the French Branch's Federal Council during the Siege and

---

[121]Eichner, 88.
[122]See Chapter 2.
[123]"Letter, Elisabeth Dmitrieff to Hermann Jung, April 24, 1871," in *Lettres de communards*, 36–37.
[124]This is strongly indicated the "Letter, Hermann Jung to Karl Marx," March 29, 1871," in *Lettres de communards*, 24.

then returned to aid them with their work for the Commune. Clearly, these letters indicate the existence of an active network among these individuals within the Commune who were united by their very close ties to the London General Council and to Marx himself.

Furthermore, the specific interaction between Dmitrieff and Frankel seems to have been based on more than just their ties as Internationalists and their common personal connections to Marx. Several sources indicate a romantic interest on Frankel's part, albeit unrequited in Dmitrieff.[125] While the evidence for this is indirect at best, their actions in the Commune's final days, as well as their successful joint escape to Geneva in its aftermath denote some degree of personal relationship.

While a romantic link remains impossible to prove, the two unquestionably shared the experience of being non-French nationals deeply involved in a French Civil War. Despite the ardently internationalist language utilized by the Commune in many formal statements, national chauvinism began rearing its head in the form of attacks made on both Frankel and Dmitrieff by some of their fellow Communards as the Commune's military situation worsened. Frankel related to Marx that political opponents repeatedly spread the charge that he, due to his Prussian citizenship, served as an agent of Bismarck.[126] While no record exists of similar attacks on Dmitrieff from the period of the Commune itself, such accusations seems likely based on the subsequent writings of the Commune's unofficial participant/chronicler Lissagaray. In his postmortem characterization of Dmitrieff, he describes her as a "Russian princess" who "left her

[125]Singer-Lecocq, 170–71; and Braibant, 188.
[126]See Chapter 2.

husband in the lurch" and who, rather than serving the interests of Parisian women, played the part of a young Russian aristocrat on holiday.[127] This shared experience of fighting for a perceived internationalist cause with some who characterized them as outsiders also likely contributed to a common bond between Dmitrieff and Frankel beyond their shared ideology, a bond that greatly facilitated Dmitrieff's work for the *Union des Femmes* by providing a powerful ally within the Commune's government.

While much of Dmitrieff's work at the *Union* focused upon using her political associations to further the cause of gender equality in economic matters, the deteriorating military situation faced by the Commune in early May also called upon her to intervene in matters of morale. On May 3, a group of Parisian *citoyennes* released a public "Appeal for Conciliation" to both the Commune and the Versailles Government for peace. Speaking as mothers, wives, and daughters they called upon both sides to bury their differences over the war with Prussia and economic disparity by looking to their "hearts" and "generosity," rather than focusing on their ideological differences. The main thrust of their argument held that the men on both sides should, due to the intense suffering of wives and mothers who feared for their children and husbands give up the conflict as a gift to the women of Paris. While this appeal couched itself as appealing to both sides to accept a peaceful settlement, it called directly upon the Commune to begin negotiations as soon as possible with Thiers to establish an armistice.[128]

For Dmitrieff and the *Union des Femmes*, this appeal represented a multifaceted threat that had to be addressed as soon as possible. While the Commune had not

[127]P.O. Lissagaray, *Huit journées de Mai*, 211.
[128]Issued on May 3, published in the *Journal Officiel*, May 4, 1871.

addressed every issue raised by the *Union*, it had already demonstrated itself more responsive to the political and economic concerns of women than any previous government in either French or European history. Thus for Dmitrieff and her fellow feminist activists the Commune presented the first opportunity to push for the implementation of measures designed to challenge gender disparity and thus realize real equality. Its dismantling through either a negotiated peace or conquest would extinguish what they hoped would be a catalyst for the challenging of gender norms on an international scale. For these reasons, the opposition of Dmitrieff and the *Union* to any appeal for an armistice was a foregone conclusion. However, the fact that the *citoyennes* who drafted this appeal did so in the name of all Parisian women necessitated a particularly vigorous response. For one, Dmitrieff and her fellow *Union* members viewed themselves as the sole voice of Parisian women, as demonstrated by the confrontation in late April with the Montmartre Vigilance Committee. Moreover, the authors of the May 3 appeal heavily utilized a traditional gendered view of women as passive supplicants only capable of viewing politics through the prism of their roles as wives and mothers, a view that subverted Dmitrieff's efforts to equalize the political and economic roles of women and men under the Commune.

Within three days, the *Union des Femmes* response appeared in poster form throughout Paris. Authored by Dmitrieff and signed by the other members of the *Union*'s Central Committee, this document, despite brimming with righteous anger, still reflects a distinct understanding of the political environment within the city in early May. It begins by declaring that the *Union* "protests with all its might" the "shameful proclamation"

issued by a group of "anonymous reactionaries" calling for "conciliation between freedom and tyranny, between the people and their oppressors." Given the nature of the May 3 appeal, this proclamation, unlike earlier documents drafted by Dmitrieff, employs much more overtly ideological language to establish the contrast between the *Union* and the "reactionaries." Establishing the Commune as the best hope for the working classes' realization of the "social and international Republic," Dmitrieff employs language that is unmistakably Marxian throughout the document, with repeated emphasis on the Commune's struggle constituting "the replacement of the rule of Capital by the rule of Labor." In a similar vein, she invokes the internationalist implications of the Commune's battle, asserting that the Commune "represented the international revolutionary principles of all peoples—contains the seeds of the Social Revolution." This contrast with the earlier documents Dmitrieff authored for the *Union*, which framed their appeals in less ideologically explicit calls for equality, illustrates the perceived need to strongly delineate the *Union*'s pro-war position in contrast to the conciliatory propositions put forth in the May 3 appeal.[129] At this moment of crisis, with the French Army hammering the city's defenses daily, it appears likely that Dmitrieff understood that the need for ideological vigor trumped more cautious and inclusionary language.

However, within this proclamation's revolutionary fervor Dmitrieff's keen political acumen remains apparent in regards to the *Union*'s continued relations with the Commune itself. While ideologically aggressive in the rhetorical sense, Dmitrieff still treads carefully in terms of discussing the relationship between rights, revolution, and gender within this document. While asserting that "the women of Paris will prove to

[129]Published May 6, 1871. Appears in the *Journal Officiel*, May 8, 1871, 502.

France and the world that at the hour of greatest danger…they are as capable as their brothers of giving up their lives in the cause of the Commune," she then quickly follows by proclaiming that victory will allow "men and women workers in complete solidarity…to defend their common interests… and extinguish all trace of exploitation and exploiters."[130] As in earlier documents issued to the Commune's government, Dmitrieff here carefully avoids any language that could be construed as advocating specific rights for women, framing the drive for equality in explicitly class terms that encompassed both men and women. Dmitrieff's accounting for any potential political consequences that her language might have in the *Union*'s vital relationship with the Commune's government demonstrates her growing capacity to navigate the complexities of Paris radical networks forged by her experiences and interactions with her fellow Parisian radicals.

While battling internal threats to the Commune's morale (and the *Union*'s agenda) presented important challenges, the restructuring of the economic order along more equitable gendered lines remained Dmitrieff's and the *Union*'s primary objective. While her appeal to the Commission of Labor and Exchange in late April/early May resulted in the Commune's conditional awarding of future National Guard uniform contracts to *Union*-led producers' associations, the document itself only discussed long-term issues of women's production in the vaguest terms.[131] Such wartime emergency measures might dissolve into smoke in peacetime, particularly given the opposition of many Communards to women becoming permanent fixtures within the labor force

[130]Ibid.
[131]See above, 39–43.

outside the home. Moreover, the Commune's response focused only on government contracts involving female labor. It as yet remained silent on introducing measures to aid women's producer associations in establishing themselves as competitors with private industry. Hence Dmitrieff, in consultation with her fellow *Union* members, as well as Frankel and Malon,[132] began developing a nuanced justification for the permanent presence of women within the workforce as well as detailed blueprints detailing how their labor would be organized.

The product of these efforts was a "Proposal for the Organization of Producer's Cooperatives for Women," a document that encapsulates how Dmitrieff's experiences within the Paris radical community honed her ability to navigate the thin line between ideological aspirations and political pragmatism. Crafted in mid-May by Dmitrieff, this proposal begins with a systematic ideological assessment of the Commune's long-term significance, clearly aimed at defining the revolution in terms most amenable to Dmitrieff's and the *Union* goals. To this end, Dmitrieff starts by placing the Commune in a broad historical context: "the Revolution of March 18th, carried out spontaneously by the people in a historically unique situation, represents a major victory for the rights of the people in the relentless struggle that they have waged against all forms of tyranny."[133] Dmitrieff's goal here is multifaceted and rooted deeply in the political struggles raging within the Commune by mid-May. In the last days of April, the Commune's representatives engaged in a vicious debate over the issue of creating a five-man

---

[132]Malon briefly alludes to his and Frankel's participation in this regard in Malon, *Troisieme Defaite*, 274–75. Also, Malon's signature on an order to produce 200 copies appears on the final document.

[133]"Proposal for Organization of Producer Cooperatives for Women," reproduced in Jacques Rouguerie, ed. *Process des Communards* (Paris: Julliard, 1964), 228–30; and Braibant, 146-48. While the document itself is unsigned, Eichner, Thomas and Braibant all cite Dmitrieff as having written the document.

Committee of Public Safety to bring greater centralization and focus to the faltering war effort with Versailles. Supporters of the measure contended that in the face of the present crisis, the Commune must, according to the Blanquist Edouard Vaillant, "become like the first Paris Commune (during the French Revolution's radical phase), an assembly of executives working together, not a parliament where everyone gets to speak."[134] This initiative, aimed at recapturing the spirit of 1793, threatened to undercut the Commune's responsiveness to its electorate by producing a potential dictatorship born of military necessity.[135] Realizing this possibility, a portion of the Commune's members vigorously but vainly opposed the measure, which ultimately passed on May 1, forty-five votes to twenty-three. Those opposed (known as the "Minority") responded publically, contending in their declaration that while "the Paris Commune has surrendered its authority to a dictatorship, they of the Minority take an 'opposite view,' namely that the Commune is beholden to the political and social revolutionary movement to accept fully responsibility…on behalf of the voters we represent."[136]

For Dmitrieff and the *Union*, the creation of a Committee of Public Safety represented a clear threat to their economic and social aspirations. In general, a concentration of power in so few hands, particularly hands no longer viewing themselves as directly responsible to the people, presented a major obstacle to gaining the governmental support necessary to realize the *Union*'s economic vision. Hence Dmitrieff's initial condemnation in her "Proposal" of "all forms of tyranny" possesses a

---

[134]*Proces-Verbaux de la Commune*, vol. I, 585.
[135]Rougerie and Edwards both note the irony of these claims, given that the original Committee of Public Safety had violently crushed the original Paris Commune as part of its centralization measures in 1793.
[136]*Proces-Verbaux de la Commune,* vol. II, 373.

more specific meaning than a generalized rhetorical attack on Versailles and the bourgeois order. However, Dmitrieff's experiences within Paris's radical community informed her that the situation presented even more dire portents for hers and other non-French radicals' goal of seeing Paris's revolution spread. Blanquists and neo-Jacobins constituted the main supporters of the Committee's creation and dominated the five man Committee itself. Large portions of both groups drew their economic inspiration from Proudhon; hence their support of a large scale reformulation of women's work was highly unlikely.[137] Moreover, while the Blanquists viewed the Commune as a potential springboard for a wider revolution, most neo-Jacobins, being all French, possessed much more limited views as to the long-term political aims of the Commune. Charles Delescluze, easily the most prominent neo-Jacobin and the leading figure on the newly established Committee, viewed the Paris Commune as inaugurating a new national model based on greater autonomy at the municipal and department level.[138] This highly limited conception of the Commune's significance hardly presented the kind of international revolutionary springboard Dmitrieff's goals required. Thus, she directly challenged this neo-Jacobin position in the "Proposal," contending that while "others have persuaded themselves of the notion that this revolution is simply a demand for a greater municipal franchise…the People, however are not blinded" and remain dedicated to the "creation of a new social order, of equality, solidarity and freedom."[139] Challenging the existing gender dynamics clearly required more than administrative reform, the Commune must

[137]Shafer, 121.
[138]Charles Delescluze, "Libéraux et Radicaux, " *Le Réveil*, August 6, 1868.
[139]Elisabeth Dmitrieff "Proposal," reproduced in Braibant, 146–48

be viewed as a break with what came before if even moderate changes were to be made to women's place in the economic and social order.

Beyond carving out a position to counter the political forces behind the Committee of Public Safety's creation, the first portion of Dmitrieff's "Proposal" also established her and the *Union des Femmes* as endorsing, albeit indirectly, the critique offered by the so-called "Minority." While her personal ideology likely contributed, Dmitrieff's support of the "Minority" also stemmed from the fact that the bulk of her political network within Paris fell within this grouping. Both Malon and Serraillier voted against the proposal, along with the majority of the International's French Branch. While her close collaborator Leo Frankel did vote in favor, he was largely driven by a growing questioning of his "revolutionary socialist opinions" due to his foreign birth and thus heavily qualified his support, stating "I cannot see the usefulness of this Committee… (and) I reserve the right to revolt against (it)."[140] While Dmitrieff avoids a direct endorsement, she utilizes language in her characterization of the Commune's significance that draws heavily upon the brand of Marxian Internationalism favored by Frankel, Serrailler, and Malon. Rather than contextualizing the Commune within a limited French context, she places the "Revolution of March 18th" within the much larger frame of Marx's historical dialectic, asserting that "the slaves began the fight, the serfs continued it and the proletariat," with the Paris Commune serving as the launching point, "will have the glory of bringing to fulfillment the revolution that brings about social equality."[141] By employing this theory of understanding the Commune, Dmitrieff accomplishes two

[140]*Proces-Verbaux de la Commune.* vol. II, 33–37. See previous chapter for a fuller discussion of Frankel's position during the Committee of Public Safety debate.
[141]Dmitrieff, "Proposal," Braibant, 146–48.

goals. First, she establishes herself and the *Union* as espousing the "Minority's" position, a calculated political risk that favored supporting the *Union*'s most prominent advocates at the Commission of Labor and Exchange over risking the potential ire of the Committee of Public Safety's members. Second, reinforcing the Commune's revolutionary nature provided greater justification for the economic and social changes Dmitrieff outlined in the second portion of her "Proposal."

Just as the first portion of Dmitrieff's "Proposal" recognizes the political realities within the Paris Commune and responds accordingly, the document's second section, focused on outlining Dmitrieff's detailed vision for organizing women's labor, presents a combination of assertion and compromise born of her understanding of gender's operation within the Commune. As in her earlier statements regarding women's labor, Dmitrieff manages to walk a fine line between promoting her goals and accounting for potential resistance from male Communards. Shifting to the issue of work, she begins by addressing the needs of all workers regardless of gender, arguing that the Commune must "complete the partial victory of the people, not by limiting itself to the urgent needs of military defense but by embarking unequivocally on the path of social reform"[142] by introducing a long-term economic restructuring program. Citing the example of the 1848 National Workshops, she contends that temporary measures, though attractive in a moment of crisis, "only result subsequently in more formidable difficulties," hence the need to introduce "organizational reforms that will continue to be valid after the circumstances that generated their initiation will have disappeared."[143] Only after this

[142]Ibid.
[143] Ibid.

call for restructuring in the name of all workers regardless of gender does Dmitrieff then focus more specifically on the issue of the reorganization of women's work. This strategic avoidance of calling for gender-based rights, illustrated in Dmitrieff's earlier pronouncements, allows her to frame her most ambitious program in terms of the larger fight to establish labor's control over production.

Upon shifting to the larger question of restructuring female labor, Dmitrieff utilizes justifications that demonstrate her continued awareness of audience. In defining the need for a new conception of women's work, she first employs a traditionalist appeal, stating that "there are mothers, women and children who suffer miseries and deprivation but who still support (the Commune) with heroism…these citizens, these mothers, are short of jobs and resources." Carolyn Eichner, in her analysis, argues that this rare use of the "traditional equation of woman as mother" denotes an effort by Dmitrieff to employ a "moral imperative" with the Commune to garner support for this ambitious project.[144] While Eichner's assessment of the stakes is quite correct, Dmitrieff's willingness to employ a wide variety of rhetorical tactics (even appeals to traditional gender norms) to engage a broad and potentially hostile audience was a seminal element in her work for the *Union des Femmes*, as the previously discussed documents demonstrate. Indeed, she follows this traditionalist statement with yet another to push her agenda, contending that the systematic introduction of regular work, rather than simple make-work programs, is necessary since the latter "tend to maintain inactivity and lower character." Finally, with potential opponents disarmed by the combination of political jockeying, generalized calls for labor's supremacy, and traditionalist appeals, Dmitrieff shifts the discussion to the

[144]Eichner, 87.

creation of "special workshops and retail centers" to allow women's producers' co-operatives to enjoy and benefit from the fruits of their own labor.[145]

The framework Dmitrieff proposes for these women's co-operatives in many ways mirrors the organizational model utilized by the *Union des Femmes*. She called first for the establishment in each *arrondissement* of a central depot for "the receiving of raw materials and for the distribution of work to individuals or groups of women, according to their skill." To run and administer these efforts, each *arrondissement* would establish a "committee of qualified and enterprising women" to oversee the process at the local level. However, to address the larger questions related to production and distribution, Dmitrieff's "Proposal" called for the establishment of a Central Committee to oversee the overall organization, as well as five other general commissions (Drafting, Purchasing, Style, Finance, and Investigating Abandoned Properties) to ensure that the local co-operatives combine their efforts in the most efficient and profitable manner possible. Dmitrieff viewed this centralized but federated model as the most effective means of transforming female productive relations first in Paris and then, when the March 18 Revolution spread, beyond.[146]

Given the vastness of this undertaking, as well as its unheralded involvement of women in organizing and benefiting from their own labor, resistance from various elements within the Commune was virtually assured. Dmitrieff, drawing on her experiences, included elements both to mediate these objections and to address certain constraints placed upon her program by the Commune's political and economic

---

[145]Dmitrieff, "Proposal," Braibant, 146–48.
[146]Ibid. Eichner addresses the function of each commission within Dmitrieff's proposed co-operative system in greater detail, 84–91.

parameters. While Dmitrieff envisioned a co-operative producers' federation that, in combination with the *Union des Femmes*, would allow women to control their own economic and social circumstances to a marked degree, she also understood that broadcasting this level of independence almost guaranteed a backlash. Hence, throughout her "Proposal," she emphasizes that this model would be under the constant oversight and indirect control of the male-only Commission of Labor and Exchange. This relationship can be understood largely in financial terms, as Dmitrieff held that the Commission "would make available in each district a weekly credit to cover the immediate costs entailed in the actual organization of work for women."[147] Furthermore, she holds that the Commission would also establish and run distribution centers to supply raw materials to each *arrondissement's* co-operatives. With the Commission providing the initial capital to establish these women's co-operatives, as well as the necessary infrastructure, a degree of oversight was understandable and necessary. Dmitrieff characterized this relationship as part of the women's co-operatives' "apprenticeship under the Commune."[148] To Proudhonists and other potential critics, these proposed measures by Dmitrieff gave potential assurance that these female undertakings would be guided by male hands. For Dmitrieff, who understood the support she enjoyed from Frankel and Malon at the Commission, this so-called oversight consisted of little more than a means to hide an economic and social arrangement in which Paris's women would enjoy near total autonomy.

[147]Dmitrieff, "Proposal," Braibant, 146–48.
[148]Ibid.

Though a supportive radical network and some rhetorical sleight of hand allowed Dmitrieff to deflect potential attacks on the independence of these women's co-operatives, her "Proposal" still recognized and allowed for certain economic realities within the Commune. Dmitrieff's personal ideology, drawing heavily on Marx, envisioned an economic order where capitalist competition would be replaced by production based on human needs. However, capitalism remained the order of the day under the Paris Commune, a state of affairs made apparent during her attempts to win uniform contracts for women's co-operatives. Thus, in this organizational proposal, Dmitrieff structures women's co-operatives in a manner best suited to contend with capitalist competition. The above-mentioned Style Commission presents one example. Its charge would be to encourage the production of styles currently in fashion within the marketplace. Within her "Proposal," Dmitrieff also encourages the abolition of unpaid textile work in prisons and nunneries, not due to any humanitarian concern but to raise wages by eliminating unfair competition. Nor does she ignore the potential of luxury goods, arguing that areas of specialized production such as feathers and flowers "should be prepared for the future," since these fields historically have allowed "businessmen to become millionaires in next to no time."[149] Finally, speaking on the general need to rush women back to the garment trades, which she deems Paris's "first industry," Dmitrieff focuses not just on immediate benefits but long term market potential. With an eye to a period when the city was no longer under military siege, she speaks of the vast wealth to be garnered when the market was once again open to "the provinces and foreigners who

[149]Ibid.

have been deprived of articles from Paris for a long time."[150] While without question an ideological compromise, Dmitrieff's willingness to work within the existing system for the greater benefit of Parisian working women further proves her capacity to navigate the Commune's economic and political contours.

With this blueprint established, Dmitrieff and the *Union des Femmes* moved quickly to realize their project for organizing women's co-operatives. On the morning of May 17, "A Call to Women Workers" appeared on walls and posts throughout Paris, announcing a joint measure by the *Union des Femmes* and the Commission of Labor and Exchange to begin "the formation and federation of unions for women workers corresponding to those of male workers." Strategically noting that the Commission of Labor and Exchange "entrusted" the *Union des Femmes* with this effort, it calls women to a meeting in the 10th *Arrondissement* that evening to elect delegates to serve on the local and commission committees. The poster bore the signature of Dmitrieff and the *Union des Femmes* Central Committees, as well as the official endorsement of Leo Frankel in his capacity at the Commission of Labor and Exchange.[151] With this accomplished, a second meeting was held on May 21 to finalize the organization of the local committees and city-wide commissions. The success of these two meetings illustrated the value of Dmitrieff's nuanced approach, born of her experiences within the Parisian radical community, to selling the women's cooperatives to the diverse and partially hostile Commune. The young Russian aristocrat turned radical stood on the verge of seeing her ideological conception moving toward realization.

---

[150]Ibid.

[151]"Appel aux Ouvriéres," reprinted in the *Journal Officiel*, May 18, 1871, 596.

Unfortunately, only hours after Dmitrieff and her comrades left their meeting, the Commune's brief lifespan lurched toward its twilight as the French Army entered Paris late that same evening of May 21. This military crisis immediately subsumed all other matters, as the Commune girded itself for the fiery trial on the barricades. From the inception of the *Union des Femmes*, Dmitrieff had charged its members, in addition to all other matters, with grimly preparing for this possibility. Article 14 of the *Union's* statutes called for surplus money to be used "for buying kerosene and weapons for the *citoyennes* who will fight at the barricades, should the occasion arise."[152] Thus duly prepared, Dmitrieff issued her final statement to the *Union des Femmes* on May 22, calling simply for "all women and Committee members to gather immediately (at the *Union* office in the 11th *Arrondissement*) to go to the barricades."[153] The accounts of Dmitrieff's actions following this pronouncement remain fragmentary at best; however, they leave little doubt that her last services to the Commune involved a repudiation of gender norms without nuance or qualification, fighting on the barricades alongside comrades of both genders. Burying her political differences with Louise Michel, they fought side by side and commanded a detachment of twenty-five women in Montmartre prior to Michel's capture in a last-ditch defense of the Montmartre Cemetery.[154] Escaping to the east, Dmitrieff subsequently fought side by side with her frequent collaborator Leo Frankel, and, as related in the previous chapter, the two made a final

---

[152]"Administration du comité central de l'Union des femmes pour la défense de Paris et les soins aux blessés," in *La Sociale* April 20, 1871.
[153]Elisabeth Dmitrieff to the *Union des Femmes*, May 22, reprinted in Braibant, 156.
[154]Louise Michel, *La Commune* (Paris: P.V. Stock, 1898), 266; and P.O Lissagaray, *Histoire de la Commune de 1871* (Brussels: H. Kistemaeckers, 1876), 327.

appearance, both wounded, at the courthouse in the 11th *Arrondissement* before escaping Paris and arriving in Switzerland.[155]

Elisabeth Dmitrieff's experience, like that of Leo Frankel, illustrates the complexities and challenges facing non-French radicals balancing their service to the Paris Commune with the pursuit of their own ideological aspirations. Given that Dmitrieff's agenda included both promoting Internationalist socialism and addressing the social and economic inequalities facing women, the obstacles she had to overcome in Paris were even greater than those faced by her comrade Frankel. However, like Frankel she benefited greatly from the connections she forged with Paris's transnational radical community, both prior to her arrival in the French capital and during her time in the city itself. Her creation of the *Union des Femmes* would have proved impossible without the aid of Natalie Lemel and other Parisian radicals, whose experience and connections aided Dmitrieff in navigating Paris's complex and at times contentious radical community. While Dmitrieff worked energetically to promote her combined vison of internationalism and greater gender equality, she discovered as Frankel had that ideological negotiation and compromise were necessary in the face of other radical factions' opposition. Faced with these challenges, particularly the misogynistic views of the Proudhonists and some neo-Jacobins, Dmitrieff operated within the constraints imposed upon her by the political realities. Ultimately, Elisabeth Dmitrieff adopted an approach of negotiation and concession in the name of bringing Paris's revolution to fruition and seeing its potentially emancipatory model proliferate far beyond the city's boundaries.

---

[155]Lissagaray, *Historie*, 379.

Chapter Four

A Son of Poland: Jaroslav Dombrowski, Revolutionary Paris, and Polish Liberation

"The Commune admitted all foreigners to the honor of dying for an immortal cause…Thiers, the bourgeoisie, the Second Empire, had continually deluded Poland by loud professions of sympathy...The Commune honored the sons of Poland by placing them at the head of the defenders of Paris."[1] So reflected Karl Marx in his *The Civil War in France* on the contributions made by the numerous Poles who served in the Communard ranks. While the Paris Commune contained representatives from many European nations, no other nationality served revolutionary Paris in numbers comparable to the stateless Poles. While several rose to prominence, none rose higher than the thirty-five-year-old aristocrat and professional soldier Jaroslav Dombrowski, who served the Commune as a National Guard officer and eventually as the Commandant of the Paris defenses. Widely considered the Commune's most able commander, both contemporaries and scholars assert that his single-minded efforts commanding the city's fortification allowed the Commune a much longer lease on life that it would have enjoyed otherwise.[2] In explaining why Dombrowski served and, ultimately, died for the Paris Commune, most scholars describe his motivations as simple patriotism, arguing, as Stuart Edwards does, that he and his fellow Poles fought "against the Prussians and then for the

---

[1]Karl Marx, "The Civil War in France," in Karl Marx and V.I. Lenin, *Civil War in France: The Paris Commune*, ed. Nikita Fedorovsky (New York: International, 1993), 65.

[2]Benoît Malon in *La Troisième Défaite du Prolétariat Français*, 476, praised Dombrowski as "the noble champion of the universal republic, heroic Dombrowski. Lissagaray in his *Historie*, 337, expresses a similar assessment. Both Stuart Edwards in *The Paris Commune* and Alistair Horne in *The Fall of Paris* describe Dombrowski as the Commune's most able military leader.

Commune in the hope that a regenerated France would go to the aid of an oppressed Poland."[3]

While the cause of national liberation without question drove Dombrowski, he envisioned Poland gaining its freedom by means of a particular revolutionary formula. Thus Dombrowski's unquestioned patriotism constituted patriotism of a particular sort, a patriotism aimed at establishing a Polish state based on popular participation and equitable approaches to social and labor questions. In essence, as this chapter will demonstrate, Jaroslav Dombrowski viewed the Paris Commune not only as a means to achieve Polish liberation but also as a model of governance to be exported to his homeland. Moreover, his experiences during both the siege and the Commune, driven (as was the case with Frankel and Dmitrieff) by his interactions and negotiations with his French and non-French comrades, aided in further shaping and refining the nature of this political vision. Furthermore, his investment in the Commune as an exportable revolutionary model for Polish liberation inspired him to serve it loyally despite military incompetence and treasonous slanders until his death on the barricades during *Semaine Sanglante*.

Like Elisabeth Dmitrieff, Jaroslav Dombrowski's origins contained little to indicate his eventual role as a revolutionary. Dombrowski was born on November 12, 1836, forty-one years after Poland's extinction as an independent state, to a long-established but impoverished Polish noble family. His father, Wiktor, served in the Czar's army and was stationed at the time in Zhitomir (formerly Żytomierz, Poland).[4]

---

[3]Edwards, 233.
[4]Jaroslav Dombrowski Dossier, BB24 868, *Archive Nationales.*

Dombrowski spent his early years, along with his younger brother Theophile,[5] in that city, before illness took his parents and relatives sent him to a military academy at the Brest-Litovsk Fortress. Despite a slight build and the handicap of his Polish background, Dombrowski excelled at the military academy and won a position at the Artillery Academy in St. Petersburg in 1851.[6] According to one source, Dombrowski developed a relationship with his mathematics professor, a Colonel Lavroff, who encouraged the young cadet to work for Polish liberation as part of the larger struggle against Czarist tyranny.[7] His national resentments aside, Dombrowski received high marks in St. Petersburg and earned his commission in 1855. Following graduation, he served in Russia's campaigns in the Caucasus. The four years he spent there further accelerated his military career, winning him a promotion and the Saint-Stanislas Medal for bravery. Dombrowski's reputation led him next to the General Staff Academy in St. Petersburg in 1859, an appointment usually reserved for young rising stars within the Czarist officer corps.[8] However, his second stay in St. Petersburg proved transformative, as the young officer began his evolution from soldier to potential revolutionary.

At the time of Dombrowski's arrival, the General Staff College constituted a hotbed of both nationalistic and anti-Czarist conspiracy. Young Russian officers, influenced by the critics of Nikolay Chernyshevsky[9] and others, pushed for political

[5]Few records exist regarding Theophile Dombrowski between his youth, where it appears he also went into military service and his appearance in Paris during the Commune, where he also served as a military commander along with his brother.
[6]Raoul Dubois, *A l'Assaut du Ciel--: la Commune Racontée* (Paris: les éditions ouvrières, 1991), 257.
[7]Daniel Granine, *Dombrowsky*, trans. Georges Arout (Paris: Les Éditeurs Français Réunis, 1956), 106.
[8]Ibid, 107.
[9]Elisabeth Dmitrieff would draw similar inspiration from Chernyshevsky's works. See Chapter 3.

liberalization and land reform. They also supported Polish and Ukrainian officers[10] who, though they shared their Russian comrades' general liberalism, drew inspiration from the growing struggle for Italian independence and thus pursued their own agendas of national liberation. Dombrowski soon became deeply involved with Lieutenant Zygmut Sierakowski, seen as the leading figure among Polish patriots at the College.[11] While some Polish officers believed independence could be realized incrementally through concessions on the part of Alexander II's government, those within Dombrowski's and Sierakowski's circle felt that armed insurrection provided the only viable route to Poland's freedom. Assessing Dombrowski and his circle's ideology beyond that of national liberation at this point is difficult. Sierakowski, prior to meeting Dombrowski, operated within the same circles as both Chernyshevsky and Taras Shevchenko before the latter's death in early 1861. While politically engaged, this group, like other intellectual circles within St. Petersburg at the time, engaged with ideology only in the most general sense. Rather, they adhered to a kind of vague liberalism, promoting a more rationalized system of government, greater political participation, land reform, and a vision of pan-Slavism still heavily influenced by Romanticism.[12] Thus, while likely influenced by these general principles, it appears Dombrowski's primary focus at the time centered on the question of Poland's emancipation.

---

[10]Interestingly the support given to Polish and Ukrainian (or Little Russian, as it was known at the time) independence stemmed not just from a liberal impulse but from an almost chauvinistic Russian nationalism that insisted Russia would be best served when shed of "other peoples." See Adam Ulan, *Prophets and Conspirators in Prerevolutionary Russia* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1998), 91.

[11]Piotr Stefan Wandycz, *The Lands of Partitioned Poland, 1795–1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984), 160.

[12]When Elisabeth Dmitrieff began operating within these same St. Petersburg circles in the mid-1860s little had changed in terms of ideology, aside from a growing but undeveloped Marxian influence.

While Dombrowski deepened his dedication to the cause of Poland's independence in St. Petersburg, events elsewhere, particularly within the Polish proper, began to accelerate. Dormant since the failed uprisings in the early 1830s, Polish political activism began to spike in the late 1850s. Influenced by Italy's liberation struggle, particularly its victory with the aid of Napoleon III in 1859 against Austria, Polish students began organizing in the hopes that a combination of internal and external forces would aid them in throwing off the Russian (and, eventually Austrian and Prussian, yoke). Though Polish university students organized in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Dorpat (now Tartu, Estonia), and Kiev, Warsaw rapidly developed as the epicenter of the growing national liberation movement.[13] The Warsaw School of Fine Arts and the Medical School became the foci of political activity, with pro-independence activists dividing between Whites, who supported non-violent means, and Reds, who advocated conspiracy and armed insurrection to realize liberation.[14] Initiated at the universities, the independence movement grew in strength by 1861, organizing a series of political marches and other manifestations. This soon led to bloodshed, as Russian troops fired on protestors in February and April, leading to tensions that resulted by fall in martial law being instituted in Warsaw. This violent response led to the independence movement's radicalization, with the now-ascendant Reds establishing a City Committee to organize their efforts against the Russian government.[15] Thus, by the end of 1861, Warsaw constituted a political tinderbox, capable of igniting the fires of Polish national aspirations at any moment.

---

[13]Ibid, 159.
[14]*The History of Poland Since 1863*, ed. R.F. Leslie (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980), 11–12.
[15]Wandycz, 164–67.

Following these developments from St. Petersburg, Dombrowski recognized that he needed to be in Warsaw if he wished to participate in this independence push. Offered a position on the Russian General Staff, a high honor for a non-Russian, he astonished his superiors by refusing the post. Instead, he asked to be sent to Warsaw, claiming relatives within the city needed his financial support. Assigned to the 6th Infantry Division in Warsaw, now Captain Dombrowski assumed the post of division quartermaster in early February 1862,[16] arriving in a city becoming starkly divided between its Russian Government and its Polish population.

Upon arriving, Dombrowski's new military assignment rapidly became a side note to his political activity. Already well-known through his Polish connections at the General Staff College, he quickly established himself as the leading figure within the Red faction of the independence movement.[17] His unique position as liaison between the Reds and the revolutionary officers serving in the Russian garrison (of which he was the head as well) accounted in part for his rapid rise to prominence. Moreover, unlike previous figures within the Red faction who favored conspiracy, Dombrowski immediately began formulating a plan for a direct armed insurrection. Drawing heavily upon Garibaldi's successful "Expedition of the Thousand" in Sicily, he began identifying individuals who might serve as the vanguard of the uprising. He asserted that while the initial force might seem small, popular support (as was the case with Garibaldi in Sicily) would result "in a rapid increase in strength like an avalanche."[18] However, drawing not

[16]Granine, 109
[17]Due to his slight build and stature, members of the Warsaw independence movement referred to him at time as "Dombrowski the Short."
[18]Quoted in Ibid, 110.

just on events in Italy but also the failures of the various 1848 uprisings, Dombrowski coupled his vision of mass mobilization with a detailed strategy to seize Warsaw rapidly and to prepare for the inevitable assault by the Russian Army.

To this end, he outlined a set of initial targets of importance for capturing the city. Key to his plan was the cooperation of the Russian officers in the city, whom he believed would neutralize Warsaw's 16,000 man garrison, at least during the initial hours of the uprising. With the Russian forces temporarily neutralized, Dombrowski's plan called for the capture of several key points within the city, including the seat of Russian power at Warsaw Castle but particularly the Novogeorgevsk (Modlin) Fortress and its store of nearly 30,000 rifles. Thus in control of these strategic points and equipped with arms for the population, he then intended that the Polish insurrectionists build barricades throughout the city and prepare for street fighting with the Russian Army when it arrived.[19]

While this constituted a sound military approach, Dombrowski's plan could only succeed with unified political support among Warsaw's independence movement. While the Reds fully endorsed Dombrowski's approach, appointing him head of the City Committee in May 1862, the Whites hesitated. Not only did they fear a military confrontation, but they also questioned the political stance of the Reds on the peasantry. Dombrowski and his fellow Reds favored a plan that, for Poland in 1862, constituted an effective agrarian revolution. Polish peasants would enjoy full emancipation and equal status as citizens, as well as benefiting from agrarian reform. While certainly not radical by the standards of nineteenth-century Western Europe, particularly when contrasted later

[19]Wandycz, 169–70; Granine, 111–12; and DuBois, 257–58.

with the Commune, the White ranks contained many Polish nobles who, though willing to accept gradual agrarian change, balked at supporting an insurrection plan tied to such a revolutionary premise.[20] Hence, when Dombrowski presented his plan to the newly established National Central Committee (split between Whites and Reds) in June, they rejected it. Dombrowski deeply resented this action, particularly the Polish nobility's White members whom he viewed as placing their class and economic interests above those of the Polish nation. The Reds, most of whom supported his plan, were drawn predominantly from students and other urban dwellers. This reality led Dombrowski to focus primarily on the revolutionary potential of the cities, a lesson that would reassert itself in France eight years later.

Despite the National Central Committee's rejection of his insurrection plan, Dombrowski continued to prepare for a possible uprising. He still enjoyed the full support of the revolutionaries among the Warsaw Garrison's officers, as a well as a substantial portion of the Reds. In order to sustain support within the officer corps, wealthy Reds provided Dombrowski with 6,000 rubles to fund his efforts within the military.[21] While sustaining sympathizers within the Warsaw garrison remained vital, Dombrowski and other Reds realized they needed to swell their ranks prior to attempting an armed insurrection. To this end, Dombrowski organized a rally to be held outside of Warsaw Castle on July 14, 1862. For the event's apex, he planned a bombastic speech invoking the Bastille and the other popular mass actions of 1789 to inspire similar ardor

[20]Leslie, 13 and Wandycz, 171.
[21]W. Swiatkowski, *Les Polonais et La Commune de Paris* (Paris: Librairie Générale, 1876), 92.

from Warsaw's citizens against their Russian oppressors.[22] While this scheme fizzled, Dombrowski's turning to the French revolutionary tradition illustrates the power he viewed it as possessing as a mobilizing force for national liberation. This would not be the last instance where he viewed Paris as a means to realize his ends for Poland.

The failed July 14 rally marked the beginning of a problematic period for Dombrowski. Russian officials began unraveling the garrison's officers' involvement in Warsaw's Polish liberation movement. In late June, several junior officers of Polish and Ukrainian descent had been arrested and executed. Though these fellow radicals had not given up Dombrowski, their arrest clearly indicated that the Russian government possessed informants among his circle of revolutionaries. Regardless, Dombrowski pressed on, meeting with supporters throughout the city to prepare them for an uprising on August 20. During a party held by some wealthy sympathizers, Dombrowski met Pelagia Zgliczyńska, a nineteen-year-old teacher with whom he soon began a relationship. However, this budding romance, as well as Dombrowski's efforts to engineer a Warsaw uprising, came to an end on August 14, 1862, with his arrest by the Russian authorities as part of a purging of revolutionary elements from the Russian garrison.[23] For the next two years, the Russians held Dombrowski and hundreds of others in Warsaw Castle. Deprived of experienced military leadership, the eventual January Uprising proved a horrific failure. Faced with over 100,000 Russian soldiers and lacking any foreign support, the poorly organized and led Polish revolutionaries proved unable to

[22]Granine, 114.
[23]Wandycz, 172. Coupled with this purging of revolutionary officers was the introduction of a military draft that specifically targeted known Reds within Warsaw. Though not arrested, those drafted found themselves stationed deep within the Russian and thus effective neutralized.

gain any military advantage in over a year of fighting. Ultimately, this bid for Polish independence ended in early 1864 with over 20,000 Poles killed, 400 executed, and 18,000 sent into exile.[24]

For Dombrowski in 1864, the question remained whether he would number among the executed or the exiled. Despite being allowed to marry Pelagia Zgliczyńska while in prison, he was brought before a military court in early November 1864. On November 10 Dombrowski received a sentence of fifteen years hard labor in Siberia, spared the firing squad largely due to his arrest before the Uprising.[25] The failure of this effort provided him with several insights as he prepared for transportation east. Without question, the Uprising's failure stemmed in part from the lack of clear military planning, an omission largely the result of the rejection of his proposal. Further, upper class Poles, such as those numbered among the Whites, failed to divorce themselves from their own economic interests for the sake of the nation. Hence the popular masses appeared to be the only real mechanism for realizing Poland's liberation. Finally, the ease with which the Russian military had crushed the Uprising illustrated that Polish independence required outside support, likely in the form of another Great Power, to be a realistic proposition. These conclusions would come to influence heavily Dombrowski's actions in France during both Paris's Siege and the Commune.

However, Dombrowski stood to gain little from these insights while laboring as an exile in Siberia. Following his sentencing, Russian authorities shipped Dombrowski and other Polish prisoners to Moscow in preparation for transit eastward. Fortunately for

[24]Ulam, 121–25.
[25]Dubois, 258.

Dombrowski, Polish revolutionaries, informed of his presence in Moscow, used their connections with Nicholas Ishutin and his circle to facilitate his escape from prison on December 1.[26] Hidden until early January 1865, Dombrowski managed then to escape to St. Petersburg where former associates arranged for his passage to France. With the aid of both Polish and Russian radicals, Dombrowski first attained passage across the Baltic to Stockholm, where he reunited with his wife before arriving in Paris sometime that June.

Between 1865 and 1870, Jaroslav Dombrowski, former Russian officer, Polish insurrectionist, and fugitive from Czarist justice, resided primarily within Paris and became immersed in both the native Parisian and foreign radical communities. Arriving with thousands of other radical émigrés from Poland and the Russian lands, Dombrowski constituted part of a new wave of immigration to France. Previous waves of Polish political refugees, particularly the 7500 Poles who had arrived following the failed November 1830 insurrection, primarily consisted of political, military, and intellectual elites drawn from noble families. These immigrants largely enjoyed the welcome and sympathy of the French government and upper classes.[27] However, this post-1863 wave, as Woodford McClellan notes, "represented in part the middle and even lower classes...These individuals, many of them political radicals, constituted a serious problem

---

[26]Ishutin's circle composed of the secret societies operating within Moscow in the mid-1860s focused on vague goals of using conspiracy to liberate the peasantry. Ulam, 251, describes Ishutin's and similar organizations as "revolutionary encounter groups" of the proto-nihilist sort. Ishutin himself was implicated in the attempted assassination of Alexander II in 1866 and split the rest of his life between prison and mental institutions. See also Claudia Verhoeven, *The Odd Man Karakozov: Imperial Russia, Modernity, and the Birth of Terrorism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).

[27]Initially suspected of having ties to French Radicals, the Ministry of the Interior cleared the main Polish émigré organizations of this charge and nearly all enjoyed good relations with the July Monarchy, as well as the Second Empire. See Eugene Kisluk, *Brothers from the North: The Polish Democratic Society and the European Revolutions of 1848–49* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005), 1–17.

for France."[28] Though noble by birth, Dombrowski's involvement with the independence movement's Red faction clearly placed him within this category. This wave of foreign radicals corresponded with a resurgence of French radicalism as the French Branch of the First International, founded less than a year before, and temporarily enjoyed the limited toleration of Louis Napoleon's "Liberal Empire." Over the next five years Dombrowski would engage with various elements within this diverse Parisian radical community and, as a result, his political thinking regarding the best means of achieving Polish liberation would evolve.

Soon after arriving in Paris, Dombrowski accepted a position on an aid committee for recent Polish immigrants to Paris, which appears to have provided him with income.[29] While this work continued his engagement with the Polish émigré community, it appears that soon after his arrival Dombrowski began engaging with a wide array of French radicals. At the onset a shared opposition to Napoleon III's Empire drove him to make these connections. Dombrowski, like many other Poles, felt that France had failed to provide support during the January Uprising despite early overtures indicating Louis Napoleon's support.[30] This led him and his fellow Poles to conclude that regime change in Paris constituted the only means of gaining French support for an independent Poland. Thus, between 1865 and 1866, Dombrowski began corresponding and meeting with

---

[28]Woodford McClellan, *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (London: Frank Cass, 1979), 136.
[29]Bronislaw Wolowski, *Dombrowski et Versailles* (Geneva: Carey, 1871), 125 *Bibliothèque nationale de France*. This document, written by a Polish émigré who formed a legion to fight the Prussians in 1870, constitutes a vital contemporary source. Written largely to combat allegations Dombrowski served as an agent of Versailles, it also contains biographic information not present in any other source.
[30]Wandycz, 174.

representatives from different strains of Parisian radicalism, specifically Auguste Vermorel, Charles Delescluze, and Eugene Varlin.[31]

Vermorel, a young journalist from the Rhône region, presents a perfect example of the complex and fluctuating ideological situation Dombrowski encountered in his first forays into the Parisian radical community. Arriving in Paris in 1861 to found a newspaper, Vermorel began as a political liberal. However, his growing disillusionment with the Second Empire provoked a period of ideological evolution. When Dombrowski first encountered him in 1865–66, his beliefs drew on a combination of classical Jacobinism and Proudhonian mutualism. Given Dombrowski's utilization of the revolutionary tradition in Warsaw, the two enjoyed some overlap in political philosophy, though where Dombrowski stood on labor and social questions at this point is unclear. As the decade wore on, Vermorel's political shift continued as he moved toward a socialist republicanism, illustrated by his highly influential newspaper (at least in radical circles) *Le Courrier Français*.[32] Dombrowski's interactions with Vermorel exposed him both to contemporary radical currents in Paris and the fluidity of ideological adherence within those circles.

While Vermorel presented an up and coming figure within Parisian radical circles, Charles Delescluze stood as a giant on par with Auguste Blanqui and even Victor Hugo. A hero of 1848 described by Benoît Malon as a "distinguished and valiant republican propagandist," Delescluze was an example of "a Jacobin in the old tradition, passionately

---

[31]Pierre Milza, *L'Année Terrible: La Commune Mars-Juin 1871* (Paris: Perrin, 2009), 223–24.
[32]On Vermorel, see Milza, 240–43; David Shafter, *The Paris Commune* (New York: Palgrave, 2005), 122–23; and Robert Tombs, *The Paris Commune 1871* (New York: Longman, 1999), 84–85. Vermorel would be wounded on the barricades during the Commune's last week and die in prison due to lack of medical treatment.

devoted to its abstract conception of liberty and to revolution as the proper means of attaining it."[33] This vague revolutionary sentiment closely mirrors that which Dombrowski and the Reds adhered to in Warsaw prior to the January Uprising. More practically, despite spending nearly a decade in exile, Delescluze possessed connections with nearly every strand of Parisian radicalism, a network that Dombrowski hoped to access for the Polish independence movement's benefit. Furthermore, due to his middle class background and his participation in journalistic organizations and Freemasonry, Delescluze also possessed connections with more moderate elements within Parisian politics. Dombrowski needed connections among mainstream republicans, who stood to play a prominent or even dominating role in whatever government followed the Second Empire.[34] Delescluze, due to his prestige and associations, stood to be a significant asset to Dombrowski in his efforts to further his own Parisian network.

Eugene Varlin, Leo Frankel's future close collaborator, stands in contrast to the other radicals Dombrowski contacted initially in Paris. A book binder by profession, Varlin presented an actual working class radical, unlike the middle class Vermorel and Delescluze. Indeed, he opposed even collaborating with middle class activists, believing "that the workers should keep clear of the bourgeoisie."[35] Given Dombrowski's noble background, the potential for difficulty was apparent. However, Dombrowski likely viewed establishing contact with Varlin as vital, given the latter's status as one of the

---

[33]Benoît Malon. *La Troisième Défaite du Prolétariat Français*, 140; and Edward Mason, *The Paris Commune: An Episode in the History of the Socialist Movement* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1967), 18.
[34]Likely among those Dombrowski encountered through Delescluze was the young up and coming republican Leon Gambetta, who defended Delescluze in 1868 when charged with spreading anti-government propaganda by the Second Empire.
[35]Edwards, 210.

founding members of the French Branch of the International. Viewed by contemporaries as a revolutionary of "rare intelligence," Varlin's fierce and deepening opposition to the Second Empire obviously constituted one point of attraction for Dombrowski. However, Varlin's prominent position within the International promised even greater potential rewards, as he could connect Dombrowski and his fellow Polish revolutionaries with a European-wide network capable of facilitating their cause. While no record exists of the early conversations between Varlin and Dombrowski, subsequent actions by the latter demonstrate that these conversations forged a connection between the recent Polish émigré community and the International. Thus it appears Dombrowski's initial forays into Paris's radical circles bore fruit, as well as familiarized him with the city's radical landscape.

Though establishing contact with Parisian radicals to support eventual regime change in France comprised a key element of Dombrowski's agenda, he did not limit his efforts solely to radical circles within Paris. In 1866, when Italy joined the Prussian war against Austria, Dombrowski and his fellow émigrés saw an opportunity to advance the cause of Polish independence. Within days of the war's outbreak, Dombrowski traveled with Józef Hauke-Bosak, a general during the 1863 Uprising, to a meeting with Garibaldi in Florence. Seeing a weakened Austria and a friendly Italy to Poland's advantage, the two men offered to raise a Polish army in southern France to serve eventually under Garibaldi's command. In a matter of weeks, Hauke-Bosak and Dombrowski established a camp outside Dijon and began training Polish volunteers. However, the presence of these armed Poles proved embarrassing for Napoleon III's government, prompting as it

did official protests from Russia. Not wishing to antagonize the Czarist regime, the French government began pressuring the Polish émigré community to disband the force. Before tensions came to a head, the war ended and the Polish volunteers disbanded. For Dombrowski, the experience further deepened his enmity toward the Second Empire, pushing him further toward forging alliances with political radicals. It also demonstrated that his military experience might be of use in serving under a flag likely to provide support for Poland's emancipation.[36]

Dombrowski's Italian endeavor proved unsuccessful; nevertheless, it did succeed in informing the Czarist government of his presence in France. While he continued his efforts among French radicals on Poland's behalf, Russian agents repeatedly targeted him in the hopes of prompting his arrest and extradition. These efforts began upon his return to Paris in early 1867 with a Polish émigré publically accusing him of forging bank notes to fund the Polish volunteer army for Italy. Though Dombrowski possessed 45,000 francs while in southern France, these had come from subscriptions by Polish and French supporters. Angered by the accusation, he challenged his accuser to a duel, which prompted the dropping of the charge.[37] In June, the Russian government tried once again to implicate Dombrowski, this time on the much more serious charge of plotting regicide. During the Exposition Universelle d'Art et d'Industrie de 1867, Czar Alexander II visited Paris at the invitation of Louis Napoleon. During a parade held in the Czar's honor, a young Polish immigrant named Antoni Berezowski fired on a carriage carrying the two

[36]B. Wolowski, *Dombrowski et Versailles*, 126; and W. Swiatkowski, *Les Polonais et La Commune*, 93–94. Hauke-Bosak would serve under Garibaldi in the latter's Armée des Vosges during the Franco-Prussian War, dying in a skirmish just days before the armistice.
[37]Swiatkowski, 94.

emperors and their wives.[38] Though all escaped unharmed, the Czarist government loudly asserted that Berezowski's attack was the product of larger conspiracy of which Dombrowski was the mastermind. Though the French police investigated, they found no proof connecting him to the crime and refused to arrest him. While these efforts met with failure, they served to harden Dombrowski's resolve against the Czarist regime and the Empire, which he saw as all too willing to aid the Russians in their anti-Polish endeavors.

Following his fruitless efforts in the south, Dombrowski returned to the French capital and resumed his connections with various Parisian and émigré radical circles. At this point it appears that Dombrowski, benefiting from his earlier interactions with Varlin, established an even closer relationship with the International. While some scholars, such as Woodford McClellan, assert that Dombrowski simply "flittered around the fringes" of radicalism at this time, his relationship with the International seems to suggest more than "flittering."[39] As early as 1866, an unofficial Polish section of the International began operating within Paris and sending representatives to International Congresses, beginning with Geneva in September 1866. Though some Poles participated from a strong adherence to Internationalist ideology, the pro-Polish independence position adopted by the organization likely drew many more.[40] In a speech to the General Council in January 1867, Karl Marx called for a restored Polish state to allow for the historical progression of Western Europe and the German lands without the intervention of Czarist autocracy. Ending this widely published speech in a manner that likely

[38]Alistair Horne, *The Fall of Paris: The Siege and the Commune 1870-1* (London: MacMillan, 1965), 11–12.
[39]McClellan, 136.
[40]Swiatkowski, 23–27.

warmed many a Polish patriot's heart, Marx proclaimed, "There is but one alternative…either Asiatic barbarism, under Muscovite direction…or else it must re-establish Poland, thus putting twenty million heroes between (Europe) and Asia and gaining a breathing spell for the accomplishment of its social regeneration."[41] Inspired by this language, the Polish contingent from Paris grew at the Lausanne Congress in September 1867, drawing even greater interest among the French capital's émigré community. When the time came for the International Congress in Brussels the following year, Dombrowski, motivated by both an evolving personal ideology and the potential the International offered for the Polish cause, joined the delegation traveling to Belgium.

Though the Polish question barely registered during the Brussels Congress's proceedings, which focused on growing French-Prussian tensions and the continuing struggle between Marxists and Proudhonians, Dombrowski's limited participation sheds light upon his position on Internationalism, radicalism, and the Polish cause. Though he did not formally join the International, Dombrowski participated in its debates with great vigor. Perhaps his most telling statement came during a debate whether or not to condemn formally war in all circumstances between European powers. Though he expressed sympathy with the sentiments, he asserted that his "political beliefs prevented him from protesting against war as long as a people needed it to free themselves."[42]

---

[41]Karl Marx, "Poland's European Mission," reproduced in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Russian Menace to Europe*, ed. Paul Blackstock and Bert Hoselitz (London: Unwin, 1953), 104–08. A more detailed discussion on Marx and the International's position on the Polish question can be found in August Nimtz, Jr, *Marx and Engels: Their Contribution to the Democratic Breakthrough* (Albany: State of New York UP, 2000), 170–72.

[42]Quoted in Swiatkowski, 28.

Here, Dombrowski clearly established his position; while the goals of the International and like organizations appealed to his personal sensibilities, until Poland was liberated all ideology must be viewed and assessed in so far as it furthered that end. Thus, rather than "flittering," Dombrowski can be seen in his interactions with the International as supporting its efforts but not allowing it to distract from his ultimate goal.

Despite the fact that Dombrowski's trip to Belgium failed to convert him wholeheartedly to the International, his experiences with that association exhibited a deep influence on his thinking, particularly in the organizational sense. Thus within months of returning to Paris, Dombrowski played a dominant role in creating a group to bring together all Polish émigrés under one unified banner. Based on a model similar to the International's federal structure, a Central Committee of Polish Immigration was to be established in Paris as a guiding executive while different districts within the city and beyond would form their own local sections. Each section would be required to elect representatives for the Central Committee and to assure the annual collection of 25 centimes in membership dues. Of greater significance for understanding the evolution of Dombrowski's thinking regarding the relationship between political activism, radicalism, and the Polish independence cause is the organization's mission statement. While asserting that Polish liberation remains its most immediate goal, the statement continues that this Polish Committee "will take part in every armed conflict undertaken for the deliverance of any oppressed people" in order to demonstrate "its solidary with the republican ideal."[43]

[43]Ibid, 32–33.

This assertion of principles reveals how Dombrowski's experiences within Paris and with the International affected his thinking by late 1868. Previously, aiding other causes, such as Garibaldi in Italy, was viewed solely as a means of facilitating Poland's emancipation through attaining new allies. However, this new approach viewed the aiding of other national liberation efforts as a duty based on shared political beliefs. Clearly this constituted a much more revolutionary conception of the path to Polish emancipation, one that viewed the independence struggle as something that could be initiated through a struggle abroad and then spread to Poland. This reconceptualization on Dombrowski's part would come to play an important role in shaping how he responded to the French crisis that was now less than two years away.

In the meantime, this new Polish organization allowed Dombrowski to further his connections among both Parisian and foreign radicals. The meetings, particularly in the Panthéon neighborhood, drew a number of prominent radical personages. During these gatherings, Dombrowski met several labor union activists, such as Charles Armouroux[44] and Auguste Briosne, who later served the Commune. Also at this time he first met the revolutionary student Raoul Rigault, a fixture among radical circles in the Latin Quarter. Despite a wealthy upbringing, Rigault became an early and ardent convert to Blanquism and would serve the Commune as a chief policeman with a cold and efficient revolutionary vigor.[45] Another frequent attendee at these gatherings was Dombrowski's

[44]Armouroux served the Commune as the Minister of External Relations, establishing connections between Paris and the sort-lived Communes in Lyon, Marseille, and Toulon.

[45]Ibid. See also Edwards, 210–12. Rigault also possessed a very cynical sense of humor. While interrogating a Jesuit, he was told, in response to a question of profession, that the man was a "Servant of God" and his master's address was thus "everywhere." Rigault, without batting an eyebrow, directed his secretary, "Write down, X, calling himself the servant of one called God, a vagrant."

fellow Pole Paule Mink. The daughter of an émigré officer who had fled following the 1830 Uprising, Mink actively promoted women's labor organizations and encouraged education reform, particularly for girls. A speaker of "great energy," she proved an ardent advocate of non-religious, scientifically-based education during the Commune.[46] Though created to facilitate the Polish independence cause, Dombrowski's Polish Committees served to broaden his relationships within Paris and thus strengthen his bonds with the city's radical community.

Unfortunately for Dombrowski, within less than a year of the Polish Committee's foundation events conspired to prevent his active participation within both émigré and Parisian radical circles. More specifically, the Russian Third Section presented the French government with a new set of charges against him.[47] In combination with the Russian Embassy in Paris and representatives from the Finance Ministry, these agents painted Dombrowski as the mastermind behind an international counterfeiting ring based within Paris. According to the Russian government, not only was he overseeing the printing of fake Russian rubles, but also Austrian gulden, Prussian thalers, and American hundred dollar bills. Presented with these charges, the French government arrested Dombrowski in September 1869, along with several other Polish "co-conspirators." With the French police now possessing a record of his relationship with known Parisian and foreign radical organizations, the Second Empire's police demonstrated a much greater

---

[46]Gustave Lefrançais, *Souvenirs d'un Révolutionnaire sur la Question Sociale et Politique en France, 1844–1871* (Brussels:Temps Nouveaux, 1902), 322–23. Mink's work during the Commune is addressed in great detail in Carolyn Eichner, *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2004).

[47]The Third Section of the Imperial Chancellor served as the Czarist secret police both at home and abroad. Though relatively small, its network of informants resulted in effectiveness far beyond its numbers. See Sidney Monas, *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961).

willingness to cooperate with the Russians than they had in 1867.[48] Though spending nearly eight months in prison, Dombrowski managed to win acquittal on all charges in early summer 1870 and was freed, much to the chagrin of the Russian Embassy.[49] There is little doubt that this incident further reinforced his disdain for the Second Empire, just as the latter faced a growing crisis with Prussia.

Dombrowski's release from prison occurred as war clouds darkened over the Parisian horizon. Napoleon III's regime, fearing (correctly, it turns out) that a military crisis with Prussia might encourage radicals within the capital to take political advantage, began a crackdown in early summer 1870. Many prominent radicals found themselves imprisoned in Saint Pelagia, including most of the leadership of the International's French Branch.[50] Recognizing that his politics and associations might lead to his re-arrest, Dombrowski traveled to London in early June. Upon arriving, he made contact with an old associate, Vladimir Ozerov, a former follower of Ishutin who had participated in Dombrowski's rescue from exile in December 1865. Though a close acolyte of Mikhail Bakunin, Ozerov enjoyed close connections with a wide variety of Russian émigrés in London. Soon he introduced Dombrowski to Herman Lopatin, an exiled revolutionary from St. Petersburg known for his translation of the works of Marx and Engels into Russian. Between June and early September, Dombrowski stayed with Lopatin, who hoped to put the former's military experience to work for the revolutionary movement.[51]

---

[48]Jaroslav Dombrowski Dossier, BB24 868, *Archive Nationales.*
[49]The circumstances of Dombrowski arrest are found in Swiatkowski, 74–75; and Wolowski, 127.
[50]Leo Frankel among them, see Chapter 2.
[51]McClellan, 136.

The timing of Dombrowski's residence with Lopatin proves interesting, corresponding as it does with the origins of his professional and personal relationship with Marx. Indeed, the primary reason for Lopatin's presence in London that summer was to meet with Marx and coordinate with the International's General Council. The two first met on July 3 and immediately struck up a rapport, with Marx describing Lopatin as "a very wide-awake critical brain, cheerful character, stoical."[52] Within two months Marx, aided by Auguste Serraillier,[53] oversaw Lopatin's election to the International's General Council. Given the frequent contact between Marx and Lopatin over that summer, one can fairly assume Dombrowski also interacted with either Marx, other members of the General Council, or both. Several pieces of evidence support this interpretation, including Dombrowski's pre-existing relationship with Varlin (who corresponded with Marx and the General Council regularly), Marx's glowing references to Dombrowski in his writings, and the manner in which Dombrowski is mentioned in communications with the General Council.[54] While the content of such discussions is unknown, their likely occurrence shows that while Dombrowski remained a Polish patriot first, his perceptions of how his emancipatory ends could be achieved continued to broaden. Based on his subsequent actions during the next ten months, it can be

---

[52]"Letter, Karl Marx to Frederick Engels," July 5, 1870," in *Collected Works 43,* 529–31.

[53]Auguste Serraillier, a member of the General Council, is discussed in the previous two chapters as a close collaborator of Leo Frankel and associate of Elisabeth Dmitrieff.

[54]For Varlin's relationship with the General Council, see "Letter, Karl Marx to Paul Lafargue, April 18, 1870," in *Collected Works 43,* 485–86, which describes Varlin as possessing "in particular a talent for organization and an influence that cannot be underestimated." For Marx's references to Dombrowski, see *The Civil War in France*. For the references of others, see "Letter, "Elisabeth Dmitrieff to Hermann Jung, April 24, 1871," in *Lettres de communards et de militants de la Ire Internationale*, 36–37.

concluded he now viewed Poland's liberation as potentially being best realized through a much broader, international form of revolution.[55]

Ideological developments aside, events within France ended Dombrowski's interlude in London in the first days of September 1870. Word by then travelled across the Channel recounting Napoleon III's crushing defeat at Sedan and the declaration on September 4 of a French Republic. This proclamation transformed Dombrowski's and his fellow Polish émigré's attitudes toward France's government. Whereas, as Woodford McClellan notes, when war broke out with Prussia in July "the Polish émigrés showed their contempt for the government that had sheltered them" by refusing to offer their experienced services to Louis Napoleon, they flocked to the colors following the Republic's foundation.[56] Particularly for members of the Polish Committee, this new French government, still facing war with Prussia, presented a clear example of a struggle "by an oppressed people" fighting to preserve "the republican ideal."[57] Beyond these principles of course still lay their most fervent hope of a French Government, grateful for the service of Poland's sons, embarking on a foreign policy leading to Polish liberation. Hence, for Jaroslav Dombrowski, the events of September 4 promised the potential fulfillment of his emancipatory goals in an ideological manner suitable to his political sensibilities.

Upon his return to Paris, Dombrowski, after consulting with his fellow Poles, drafted a message to the President of the Provisional Government of National Defense,

---

[55]For a discussions of London's role in the international radical movement in relation to Paris, see Chapter 1, .
[56]McClellan, 136.
[57]Swiatkowski, 33.

Louis Trochu, offering himself and his fellow émigrés for service. In his appeal, he emphasized the vast military experience contained within the Polish immigrant community. He drew particular attention to their possible utilization behind Prussian lines, asserting "[t]he Polish immigration offers France excellent material for the organization of partisan units…good horsemen, accustomed to wars of surprise and ambush…most of them knowing German." Dombrowski contended further that the impending siege of Paris would make such units vital, given their ability to disrupt Prussian supply lines. In closing, he framed the Polish adherence to the struggle in ideological terms, stating "the Poles are ready to shed their blood for the French Republic."[58]

Expecting an immediate assignment, Dombrowski soon learned, to his rage, that the Provisional Government had rejected his and his fellow Poles' offer. The Government of National Defense's rebuff appears to have been the product of several factors, beginning with foreign policy. Many conservative republicans, led by Adolphe Thiers, hoped to avoid a protracted war by reaching an accommodation with the Prussians quickly. To achieve this, they intended to appeal to Great Britain, Austria, and Russia to mediate.[59] An armed Polish legion, led by Dombrowski and other fugitives from Poland's independence efforts, seemed highly unlikely to curry Russian favor in these negotiations. Along with diplomacy, Dombrowski's background and associations within Paris also played a role. The Provisional Government deeply distrusted the political intentions of Parisian radicals in the aftermath of September 4, fearing they

[58]Reproduced in McClellan, 137.
[59]Edwards, 160; and Horne, 164.

would use the present conflict to push France further to the Left. Keeping arms out of potential revolutionary hands played an important role in this, as illustrated by the Provisional Government's attempts to stall the arming of National Guardsmen from Paris's working-class neighborhoods.[60] Dombrowski, as well as many other Polish émigrés, had long traveled in the same radical circles that now made the new French Government so wary. Finally, there is some indication that Trochu suspected Dombrowski of being a Prussian agent, a false charge that reasserted itself several times during both the siege and the Commune. Thus refusing Dombrowski's offer constituted both a foreign policy measure and an act of internal security in the Provisional Government's eyes.

Trochu's and the Government's refusal to accept Dombrowski's and his fellow Poles' service alienated him from the Provisional Government from the outset. This tension and disdain only deepened with subsequent events. Despite the Provisional Government's efforts to block the raising of Polish volunteers, several such groups began organizing in the provinces with local governmental support. In Lyon, Bronislaw Wolowski, an émigré of the 1830 generation, former member of the Polish Democratic Society during the 1848 revolutions, and a friend of Dombrowski's, organized a Polish legion and sent a request to Paris for Dombrowski to be sent to lead it.[61] Trochu and the Provisional Government immediately vetoed the measure, leaving Wolowski to find another commander. A frustrated Dombrowski, in an early October letter via balloon

---

[60]Tombs, 45–46.

[61]The organization and exploits of this Polish legion are addressed in greater detail in Michael Howard, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Invasion of France 1870–1871*(New York: Routledge, 2001), 253–54 and 297–98.

post to Wolowski, spoke of his growing harassment by French authorities and proposed an attempt to cross Prussian lines without authorization to assume command in Lyon. Referencing his escape from exile in December 1865, he asserted "I have escaped prison once and I am ready to run the risk of new adventures."[62] However, the tightening of the Prussian siege lines in mid-October seems to have prevented Dombrowski from making such an effort.

Trapped within Paris and denied a meaningful role in the war effort, Dombrowski became an active member of the opposition among Paris's popular classes to the Provisional Government. Having operated within such circles since arriving in Paris, his frustration with his own situation and the overall running of the war led to a greater degree of radicalization. Symbolic of this was his active participation in the growing club movement within Paris. Closed by the Second Empire with the outbreak of war, these political clubs proliferated through the city following September 4. Most provided a venue for those on the Left to criticize the Provisional Government and its handling of the siege, as well as discussing its replacement with a popular Commune. Dombrowski, according to police reports, began to frequent these clubs in October, particularly le Club de l'École de Médecine and le Club de la Reine-Blanche.[63] The former, located in the 6th *Arrondissement*, served as a platform for the French Branch of the International. Leo Frankel, Benoît Malon, and Eugène Varlin frequently spoke at its meetings, though non-International radicals participated and gave speeches as well.[64] While Dombrowski's

[62]"Letter, Jaroslav Dombrowski to Bronislaw Wolowski, October 9, 1870," reprinted in full in Wolowski, 48–49.
[63]Jaroslav Dombrowski Dossier, BB24 868, *Archive Nationales.*
[64]See Chapter 2.

existing relationship with Varlin and the International might have initially drawn him to these meetings, the rhetoric regarding the siege and Provisional Government likely held an even deeper attraction to him. A running criticism of the Government's handling of the war characterized most meetings, with calls for its replacement by a popular Commune dominating by December.[65]

The Club de la Reine-Blanche, which was located in the 18th *Arrondissement* and dominated by Blanquists, offered Dombrowski a different ideological climate but similar sentiments. The calls there very much echoed those presented at the de l'École de Médecine. Participants called constantly for "prompt and decisive actions concerning the defense of Paris" and called on its members to prepare to march on the Provisional Government to force such actions.[66] Records of speakers at these meetings are highly fragmentary, but given their highly participatory nature and Dombrowski's already well-established position among Parisian radicals, one can reasonably conclude he contributed to the discourse at these clubs. Regardless, his attendance alone denotes that his dissatisfaction with the Provisional Government promoted a continued and broadening acceptance of a radicalized conception of just government. While his vision of an independent Poland remained the same, the political form it would take appeared in transition.

As Dombrowski engaged himself within a Parisian radical milieu becoming more polarized by the siege, a new clash with the Provisional Government further galvanized him toward the opposition. In mid-October, Giuseppe Garibaldi appeared in southern

---

[65]Martin Johnson, *The Paradise of Association Political Culture and Popular Organizations in the Paris Commune of 1871* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 168.
[66]Gustave de Molinari, *Les Club rouges pendant la Siege du Paris* (Paris: Garnier, 1871), 166.

France to offer his services to the new French Republic. Despite the skepticism of many within the Provisional Government, Leon Gambetta prevailed upon it to take advantage of Garibaldi's military experience and fame. Given a command consisting primarily of foreign volunteers and French irregulars around Autun, Garibaldi christened this force the Army of the Vosges and began seeking experienced officers to prepare and lead it into combat.[67]

To this end, on November 9 Gambetta, now in command of the war effort in the provinces from his headquarters at Tours, received the following message from Garibaldi; "Jaroslav Dombrowski, 52 rue Vavin, is necessary to me. Send me this intelligent Polish general by any means…if you could get him out (of Paris) via balloon, I would be very grateful."[68] Gambetta endorsed Garibaldi's request and sent it in the next packet to reach Paris and the Provisional Government. However, Trochu refused to send Dombrowski, citing his political unreliability and the instructions of the Government to avoid utilizing foreign, specifically Polish, soldiers against the Prussians. Dombrowski, upon learning of this third rebuff, seethed with fury. Writing to Wolowski on Trochu's obstructionism several months later, Dombrowski exhibited a deep bitterness, charging that Trochu "dislikes Poles and did everything to move them aside from where they could have rendered service."[69] However, Dombrowski also crafted a more immediate response to Trochu following the incident with Garibaldi, a scathing public attack that

---

[67]Giuseppe Garibaldi, *Autobiography of Giuseppe Garibaldi*, vol. 3, trans. A. Werner (New York: Howard Fertig, 1971), 320–25.
[68]"Letter, Giuseppe Garibaldi to Leon Gambetta, November 9, 1870," reprinted in full in Wolowski, 57.
[69]"Letter, Jaroslav Dombrowski to Bronislaw Wolowski, February 28, 1871," reprinted in full in Wolowski, 50–55.

both harshly criticized Trochu's defense of Paris and exhibited the influence of Parisian radicalism on Dombrowski's thinking.

This critique manifested itself in the form of a pamphlet published in late December or early January with the support of the Club des Révolutionnaires. Entitled "Trochu as Organizer and Commander in Chief," this sixteen page document draws heavily on Dombrowski's training as a professional military officer to attack Trochu's strategic approach to breaking the Prussian siege. However, key passages also illustrate Dombrowski viewing these military issues through a decidedly radical political lens. Indeed, in his first few words he presents Paris's struggle within a broad internationalist context, emphasizing that the Revolution of September 4 possessed potentially transformative ideological consequences. He thus contends that Trochu, "who held in his hands the destiny of Paris," bears a responsibility for events that have "a huge influence on France, even the entire world, but particularly Europe."[70] Given these potential consequences, Dombrowski's response emphasizes the need for a detailed assessment of his policies, while time still remained to chart another course.

Beginning his argument, he asserts that while the military defeat at Sedan prompted the Revolution of September 4, it was the French people, "with the intuition which belongs only to masses," that understood it was necessary to give the nation "a new direction to its moral and material force." Prior to the Republic's foundation, the Second Empire asked the French people to fight not for "fatherland, freedom and humanity," but rather "in the name of the Emperor and conquest." Moreover, Napoleon

[70]Jaroslav Dombrowski, *Trochu Comme Organisateur et Général en Chef* (Paris: Club des révolutionnaires, 1871), 1.

III's generals depended almost exclusively upon a small professional army unsupported by an effective reserve system. He contrasts this with the Prussian/German forces, which though led by "despotism and aristocracy," drew upon an excellent system that integrated the professional army with trained reservists, thus facing France with a population fully mobilized. Further and equally important for Dombrowski, the Prussians and Germans fought for a grand idea, the unification of Germany. Though other military factors contributed, Dombrowski asserts that it was this matter of superior will that ultimately led to the ease of the Prussian victory. This premise, of an armed people driven by duty to a higher cause, comprised a main theme that Dombrowski builds up throughout the document.[71]

Following this introduction, Dombrowski spends the next several pages using recent military history to demonstrate how only by fully deploying a nation's population could a state achieve victory in the late nineteenth century. He focuses particularly on the wars fought by the Second Empire in the Crimea and Italy, wars that ended without decisive decisions due to the combination of poor mobilization and a lack of mass support. Dombrowski then contrasts these French failures with the Prussian wars against Denmark and particularly Austria, which resulted in major victories by mobilizing large portions of the population. He then invokes the Revolution, arguing that the victories won under its banners, as well as those achieved under the First Empire, resulted from the *levée en masse*. Dombrowski concludes this section by asserting that "results in modern war only come through a huge deployment of troops."[72]

---

[71]Ibid.
[72]Ibid, 2–6.

With this point regarding mobilization made, Dombrowski then shifts his focus to Paris and the present Prussian conflict. While he allows that Sedan left French forces in the field greatly reduced, particularly those defending Paris, this need not have resulted in a desperate siege. Dombrowski contends that the day after the September 4 revolution, "no other country possessed the means" for waging war possessed by France but particularly by Paris. The city, "possessing means more imposing than many kingdoms," has over two million inhabitants supported by a massive industrial and financial base. Just as vital as numbers, Dombrowski contends that after September 4 the Government of National Defense possessed a cause capable of drawing tens of thousands to the colors. Although patriotism certainly played a role, the declaration of a Republic allowed Frenchmen to fight for international principles, to struggle against "despotism and aristocracy" in the name of "democracy" and particularly "la République Universelle."[73] Dombrowski's use of the last term provides strong evidence of his associations' effect on his political thinking. Condemnations of "despotism and aristocracy" constitute a generalized oppositional rhetoric used by liberals during earlier revolutionary moments in the nineteenth century. "La République Universelle" refers to a discourse first utilized during 1848 but understood by 1870 to represent a revolutionary conception of government both democratic and social in nature that served the interests of the working majority rather than capital. Moreover, drawing on the revolutionary tradition, advocates conceived of this republican form overcoming national boundaries and unifying workers under one banner. Parisian radicals in the clubs and elsewhere used calls for the "République Universelle" interchangeably with calls for a Commune, a reality of which

[73]Ibid, 6-7.

Dombrowski was quite aware. With the use of this language, Dombrowski's critique moves beyond a simple military assessment and becomes a clarion call for revolutionary change as a means of realizing Paris's deliverance.

Having crossed this rhetorical Rubicon, Dombrowski, the former professional soldier, viciously attacks the institution of standing armies. He first contends, based on the French Army's performance against the Prussians, that standing armies have proven themselves insufficient to protect the nation. Taking his argument further, Dombrowski states that, "from a social point of view," the emergence in Europe of standing armies corresponded with the entrenchment of despotism. Events during the nineteenth century demonstrate this reality, since more often than not the people had had to fight these professional soldiers in the defense of their liberty. Thus he concludes that rather than defending the nation and the people, standing armies exist in Europe primarily to defend "corporate parasites" and "establish new monarchies."[74] These assertions demonstrate an undeniable radical influence upon Dombrowski's thinking and in fact correspond quite closely with those of both the Blanquists and the International. Indeed, writing a few months later in his *The Civil War in France* Karl Marx echoes these sentiments, condemning the French standing army as a "a public force organized for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism."[75] Dombrowski, dismissing the standing army as nothing more than an instrument of oppression, then provides his blueprint as to how Paris could effectively prosecute the war against Prussia.

---

[74]Ibid, 7.
[75]Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*, 54.

This answer unsurprisingly, given his earlier military observations, consists of a *levée en masse* within Paris and calls for the mobilization of all men between the ages of eighteen and fifty within the city. Asserting that the selective mobilization of National Guard units has failed to tap into these manpower resources, Dombrowski holds that only by fully drawing on these human resources can the Prussian siege be broken. Combined with a similar effort in the provinces, he states that the threat to the Prussian supply lines would necessitate their retreat from Paris and an end to the siege. Optimistic to this point in his analysis, it is here that Dombrowski shifts toward his critique, arguing that had the Government of National Defense employed this strategy immediately following September 4, the Prussian threat was "was not insurmountable, nor even serious." However, due to the Government's failure to mobilize the French people, combined with its repeated strategic and tactical errors, the current situation in Paris, though still redeemable, teetered on the edge of disaster.[76] This potentially disastrous state of affairs Dombrowski lies at the feet of the Provisional Government's President and Commander in Chief, Louis Trochu.

In the last section of his critique, Dombrowski presents a point by point assessment of Trochu's failures as commander in chief. He begins by charging that Trochu, despite his title, did not see organizing Paris's defense but rather the protection of "existing institutions" as his chief duty. This charge specifically refers to his deference to the bourgeoisie and the Army in failing to mobilize Paris fully, due to what they viewed as the danger of arming the masses. Playing off of the document's title, Dombrowski deems Trochu a "de-organizer" given his propensity to turn down

[76]Dombrowski, 7–8.

volunteers (such as Dombrowski and his fellow Poles), disband irregulars, and, as already noted, not draw fully upon the city's and the nation's military potential. Establishing these organizational failures, Dombrowski then engages in critiquing Trochu's military moves between September and late December. Throughout this chronicling of failed sorties and missed opportunities, Dombrowski relates Trochu's repeated public pronouncements that "I have a plan." After presenting several pages of military failures, Dombrowski concludes, showing the anti-clericalism common among Parisian radicals that Trochu's plan for Paris's deliverance was to pray.[77]

Despite the grave military situation, which Dombrowski largely sets at Trochu's feet, the pamphlet ends with a stirring and highly politicized call for the last full measure in Paris's defense. Though infected by the "germ of depression in their hearts" due to repeated military failures, he asserts that all is not yet lost. Returning to one of his main themes, Dombrowski contends that victory cannot be attained by means of "Chassepots, machine guns or Greek fire" but through an ideal. Invoking both 1792 and "La République Universelle," he proclaims that a Paris fighting in the name of these principles and for the benefit of "progress, civilization and the freedom of Europe," cannot be defeated. Fired by these ideas, a Paris and a France, fully mobilized with every man armed, could still drive back the Prussians and provide the nation and Europe with a "happy result of the war." To illustrate these hopeful sentiments, he closes by invoking recent history, noting that the Union during the American Civil War suffered numerous defeats due to poor generalship before they found their Grant and won the war.[78]

---

[77]Ibid., 9–15.
[78]Ibid, 16.

This pamphlet represents in many ways a synthesis of Dombrowski's ideological evolution within Paris in relation to his long-term goals regarding Polish liberation. Without question, this critique displays political conceptions very much in line with the Parisian radicals with whom he enjoyed a long and deepening association. The repeated citing of 1792, the appeals for a "République Universelle," his attacks upon the political establishment and "corporate parasites," and his critique of professional armies all represent ideas supported by some or all strains of Parisian revolutionary thought. Related to these ideological principles, a strong internationalist sentiment permeates the document, characterized by the recurrent theme that Paris's and the new Republic's ultimate fate would have significant consequences for the rest of Europe. For Dombrowski, those consequences obviously applied to Poland, the future independence of which rested on a French republican government driven by its political tenets to adopt an interventionist policy. However, this document indicates something further: that Dombrowski's focus no longer centered solely on Poland's independence itself but on how that independence would be legitimately achieved. The fusion of his radicalization with his deep distrust of a government that operated solely for bourgeois interests (as exhibited by Trochu's administration) thus produced in Dombrowski a vision of Polish emancipation that would originate in Paris but that would be more than a product of traditional foreign policy. Rather, Polish liberation would come by virtue of the Parisian peoples' realization of the "République Universelle" and its subsequent spread to all the corners of Europe.

Despite this important political revelation on Dombrowski's part, his capacity to participate in its realization faced a major obstacle in early January 1871. His scathing attack on Trochu did not go unnoticed by its target or other members of the Provisional Government. Already viewed as a liability due to both his radicalism and his potential to antagonize the Russian government, Dombrowski's anti-government pamphlet proved the last straw. Paris police, in addition to monitoring his activities in the clubs, also noted his repeated use of his foreign passport to travel freely through the Prussian lines. Despite his use of this ability to pass messages to his fellow Poles fighting the Prussians in the south, the Provisional Government used this as a cause to arrest Dombrowski as a Prussian spy. Initially, according to his own account to Wolowski, the post commander to whom he was taken "wanted to shoot (him), despite his passport and identification."[79] However, he was ultimately returned to the city and placed in a cell, an action that produced an outcry among several of Dombrowski's radical associates. Charles Delescluze decried his arrest in his journal *Le Réveil*, asserting that Dombrowski constituted "another victim of the tyranny of the Paris government."[80] These protests proved vain, as Dombrowski remained in prison when Paris capitulated on January 28, 1871. Despite Dombrowski's fervent efforts to avoid this outcome, it ultimately proved fortuitous for him personally. With contact reestablished with the rest of France, Leon Gambetta learned of his incarceration and ordered his release in early February.[81] Fearful of further harassment by the Paris police, Dombrowski took his wife and their two sons

[79]"Letter, Jaroslav Dombrowski to Bronislaw Wolowski, February 28, 1871," reprinted in Wolowski, 51.
[80]Swiatkowski, 78.
[81]McClellan, 138.

temporarily to Lyon, where he reestablished contact with his fellow Polish émigrés who fought the Prussians.

This stay proved short-lived. Dombrowski, his personal finances like many other Parisians ruined by the siege, contacted Garibaldi in the hopes of securing a commission. With his recent election to the National Assembly[82] Garibaldi exercised enough influence within France to aid Dombrowski. On March 1, he received a letter from Garibaldi, endorsed by the French General Penhoat, stating that Dombrowski had been given a commission in the Army of the Vosges and was thus entitled to pay at the rank of colonel. In order to receive his pay, Dombrowski would have to return to Paris and present this document to the War Ministry.[83] Apparently unaware of the growing tensions between Paris and the Versailles Government following the peace treaty with Germany, Dombrowski and his family left in mid-March to return to the city and claim his commission.

As fate with have it, Jaroslav Dombrowski arrived in Paris on the evening of March 18, 1871, a day that began with a standoff between the Army and the National Guard in Montmartre and ended with the Parisian popular forces fully in command of the city. Given his known military experience, the Central Committee of the National Guard, acting as the executive authority within Paris pending the Communal elections, requested a meeting that same night with Dombrowski. Asked for his opinion regarding their next move, Dombrowski advised a rapid concentration of all National Guard units for an

---

[82]Tombs, 63–64. Garibaldi found himself in a very hostile environment in Versailles, with the Assembly dominated by monarchists of various stripes. Frustrated, he famously dismissed them as a "Rural Majority" before he left France for good.

[83]"Letter, Giuseppe Garibaldi to Jaroslav Dombrowski, March 1, 1871," reprinted in full in Wolowski, 55.

immediate march on Versailles. Arguing that the events of March 18 likely had left the Versailles Government in a disordered state, he suggested that a rapid assault would likely meet with success and allow for the dissolution of the monarchist dominated Assembly in preparation for new elections.[84]

This counsel by Dombrowski demonstrates that despite the end of the siege and his absence from Paris, his resolve to support a Parisian *République Universelle* as a means of realizing broader revolutionary change remained strong. However, the Central Committee balked, at least initially, at this proposal, arguing that their goal at present centered only on securing municipal rights for Paris. When Dombrowski responded (quite correctly) that the Versailles Government's first act upon regaining its balance would be to deploy the army against Paris, they responded that their actions must remain defensive until after the elections. Most assessments, both contemporary and modern, assert that the aggressive policies outlined by Dombrowski would have proven the correct course. Karl Marx and Mikhail Bakunin agreed (shockingly!) that not marching upon Versailles immediately proved the Commune's gravest error.[85] However, Dombrowski, bowing to the authority of the Central Committee, let the matter drop and requested a command within the National Guard.

Valuing Dombrowski's military reputation, the Central Committee commissioned him Colonel of the National Guard's 13th Legion. His presence appears to have drawn other Poles to the Commune cause, including his brother Theophile, whom Dombrowski

---

[84]Wolowski, 59–61.
[85]Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*, 66–67; and Mikhail Bakunin, "Preface to the Second Installment of *L'Empire Knouto-Germanique*," in *The Paris Commune of 1871: A View from the Left* ed. Eugene Schulkind (New York: Grove, 1974), 216–17.

aided in getting a commission commanding the 21st National Guard Legion.[86] Wolowski in his account asserts that upon Dombrowski being given a commission dozens of Poles who had wished to serve during the siege but been denied by Trochu flocked to the National Guard.[87] Among those drawn by Dombrowski's presence was Auguste Okolowicz, a fellow 1863 émigré and member of the International whom he knew from his work on the Polish committee. Okolowicz, enlisting with two younger brothers, achieved the rank of general by the Commune's final days.[88]

However, of the Poles offering to serve Paris after the March 18 Revolution, Valery Wroblewski proved without question the greatest asset to both Dombrowski and the Commune. Though no record exists of their interaction prior to the Commune, the two men must have known each other given their similar experiences and networks. Like Dombrowski, Wroblewski had trained as a professional soldier and then fought against the Russians in 1863. Fleeing to Paris in 1865, he taught piano while becoming deeply involved in émigré activities, particularly the Central Committee of Polish Immigration. Serving in a National Guard unit during the siege, Wroblewski shared Dombrowski's political principles and chose to follow him in serving the Commune, rising also to the rank of general by its end.[89] While each Polish volunteer had individual reasons for joining the Commune's ranks, it is fair to conclude that most shared Dombrowski's hope that a clear path lay between a successful revolution in Paris and Poland's deliverance.

---

[86]Swiatkowski, 102.
[87]Wolowski, 67–68.
[88]V. A. Diakov, "Communications: La Commune de Paris et les Peuples Slaves" in *Le Mouvement Social*, No. 79, La Commune de 1871 Actes du colloque universitairepour la commémoration du centenaire Paris, les 21–22–23 mai 1971 (April/June 1972), 251–52; and Swiatkowski, 103.
[89]Swiatkowski, 101.

However, Okolowicz and Wroblewski also shared Dombrowski's connections to several Parisian radical circles, allowing one to conclude that they potentially shared a similar ideological vision of Poland's emancipation as well.[90]

While long-term emancipatory aspirations were all well and good, Dombrowski recognized that the road to Warsaw began with a Commune free of internal enemies and capable of projecting its principles throughout France. Despite his warnings on March 18, the newly elected Communal Council made few initial arrangements for the city's defense. As a result, the National Guard forces manning Paris's northwestern defenses suffered a defeat at the hands of the Versailles Army on April 2. Shocked that "despite the moderation of our attitude…the royalist conspirators have attacked," the Communal Government ordered a sortie by the National Guard against Versailles the next day.[91] Rather than utilizing men like Dombrowski with military experience, the assault on Versailles, poorly planned and utilizing untrained troops, was led by prominent radicals with little to no military experience. Unsurprisingly, the April 3 sortie resulted in a rout, with thousands of National Guardsmen taken prisoner.[92] Given the scale of this disaster and the impending new siege facing Paris, the Commune began looking for new leaders with proven military talents.

These military changes began with the appointment of Gustave-Paul Cluseret, a former professional soldier, adventurer, and radical, to head the effort against Versailles

---

[90]Wroblewski's activities after the Commune further reinforce this view, as he would later in life return to Paris and become a prominent figure in the Polish Socialist Party's international branch in France.
[91]Proclamation recorded in the *Journal Officiel*, April 3, 1871.
[92]Several hundred of those taken prisoner, as well as several Parisian radical leaders, were shot after being promised their lives. See Edwards, 198–200; and Horne, 308–12.

as the Commune's War Delegate.[93] Despite his pedigree Cluseret ultimately proved a disaster as commander in chief; however, he did possess an eye for military talent. Upon assuming his duties on April 4, he appointed Louis Rossel, a talented former army officer, his chief of staff and asked that Jaroslav Dombrowski be appointed Commandant of Paris to oversee the city's defenses. Though only meeting for the first time on April 2, Cluseret later recounts that he requested Dombrowski due to both his professional military training and the high regard in which Garibaldi held the Polish officer.[94] Events would cause him to rue these decisions, since Dombrowski and Rossel both played a prominent role in his removal a month later. That, however, lay in the future and Dombrowski, given his ardent support of the Commune's cause, eagerly accepted Cluseret's offer.

However, Dombrowski's possible appointment gave the Commune's Executive Commission some pause, although not because of the Polish officer himself. Charles Delescluze, who knew Dombrowski well, supported his nomination. He also received the endorsement of the influential Félix Pyat, an 1848 Republican and newspaper editor who shared Delescluze's Jacobin views. The problem lay with how the public and the National Guard would react to receiving orders from a non-French officer. Despite the Commune's internationalist principles, many Parisians, after enduring the four month Prussian siege, viewed foreigners with great suspicion. Further, Trochu's false charge

---

[93]Cluseret's background proves a fascinating study. Trained at St. Cyr, he helped crush the June Uprising in 1848, before serving in the Crimea and being booted from the army for corruption. Traveling to the United States, he raised soldiers for Garibaldi before serving the Union cause in the American Civil War. Returning to France, he was converted to radicalism while serving time in prison with Malon and Varlin and joined the International in 1868. See Gustave-Paul Cluseret, *Mémoires du Général Cluseret* (Paris: Levy, 1887).

[94]Cluseret, 163–64.

during the siege that Dombrowski spied for the Prussian still resonated within some Parisian circles. Though the Council ultimately voted for Dombrowski's appointment on April 6, they decided to couple his selection with a public pronouncement explaining their choice.[95] Lissagaray, writing from his own recollections, provides support for the Executive Commission's decision, stating that from the time of his initial appointment in late March, certain members of the National Guard had "shown some distrust of the new general."[96] While the Commune claimed itself as the "République Universelle's" vanguard, Dombrowski discovered, like Leo Frankel and Elisabeth Dmitrieff, that internationalist sentiments and radical credentials did not place them above xenophobic-based suspicion.

This proactive approach on the Commune's part produced an official statement addressed to the National Guard on April 9 on Dombrowski's appointment. Using a combination of appeals to internationalism and outright fabrication, the Executive Committee attempted to allay any concerns about Dombrowski's qualifications or loyalty. Acknowledging that some "reproach him for being a foreigner," the statement, while recognizing that he is indeed Polish, asserted that Dombrowski possessed abilities essential to the Commune's fight against Versailles. Bolstering this claim with outright fabrication, the Executive Committee related that he led the last Polish uprising against the Russians, holding off the Czarist forces for several months before being taken. In reality, as related earlier, Russian authorities arrested Dombrowski months before the January Uprising. Along similar grandiose lines, the document cited Dombrowski's

[95]*Procès-Verbaux de la Commune,* vol 1, 141–43.
[96]P.O Lissagaray, *Histoire de la Commune de 1871* (Brussels: H. Kistemaeckers, 1876), 192.

service in the Caucasus as demonstrating his ability to protect "a people's independence menaced by an implacable enemy." The implication, of course, is that he fought against the Russian conquest of the region, when, in reality, he fought as a junior officer in the Czarist forces.[97] While some poetic license is understandable, the degree to which exaggeration is used in this document indicates how concerned the Commune's Executive Committee was about a possible nationalistic knee-jerk response to Dombrowski's appointment.

While the statement utilized these Herculean claims to recommend Dombrowski, it also presented several endorsements well-grounded in fact. The document related that Garibaldi, a military figure of mythical proportions to most common Parisians, personally requested that Dombrowski be sent to him during the siege to serve in the Army of the Vosges. However, Trochu and the Provisional Government, well-established villains in most National Guardsmen's eyes, denied Garibaldi's request and, despite the cost to the war effort, arrested Dombrowski. This fact served both to provide Dombrowski with radical credibility in popular eyes and to counter the charge that he was imprisoned as a Prussian spy. Ultimately, the address closed with a final appeal combining Dombrowski's military prowess as an "incontestable man of war" with his ideological purity as a "devoted soldier of the République Universelle."[98] Overall, this appeal by the Executive Commission on Dombrowski's behalf appears well-crafted and takes account well of the audience. On one hand, the claims regarding Dombrowski's relationship with Garibaldi and his ideological principles could be verified by those who knew him through

[97]Statement printed in *Le Journal Officiel*, April 10, 1871.
[98]Ibid.

the clubs and the International's French Branch. The claims regarding Poland and the Caucasus, in a city once again cut off from the rest of the world, would have to be accepted at face value.[99]

Despite the Executive Commission's efforts, Dombrowski's appointment still met with xenophobic resistance. The evidence for this comes from two letters to the editor reprinted in Swiatkowski's account. The first, written by a Polish émigré, responds to charges made in *La Vérité* on April 9 that Dombrowski worked for the Czarist Government and was in fact Russian. The respondent, one J. Odravonge, relates the circumstances of Dombrowski's arrival and countercharges that such accusations insult all Polish immigrants currently fighting for the Commune. In the second letter, written to an unnamed journal, another Polish émigré refutes the charge that Dombrowski is Russian, calling him a "good Pole" who suffered at the hands of a Czarist government that attempted to exile him in Siberia.[100] Though indicating a general distrust of foreigners among some of the Commune's supporters, the fracas surrounding Dombrowski's appointment also serves to demonstrate further the depths of his Parisian connections. On one hand, the address made by the Commune's Executive Commission shows the willingness of established radical comrades like Delescluze to intervene publically on Dombrowski's behalf. On the other, the letters from his fellow Polish

[99]In his memoirs, Cluseret reprints the Executive Commission's statement regarding Dombrowski and points out the errors within the documents, as well as labeling some true claims (such as Garibaldi's request) to be false. Dombrowski's role in Cluseret's removal as War Delegate likely influenced this assessment. However, Cluseret still repeatedly expresses his admiration for Dombrowski's work as a military officer, despite his condemnation of his political intrigues. See Cluseret, 168–69.
[100]Swiatkowski, 95–99.

émigrés shows his deep association with that community and its strong support of his service to the Commune.

Regardless of any lingering questions of his loyalty, Dombrowski, driven by his multi-faceted devotion to the Commune's cause, immediately threw himself into his new position as Paris's Commandant. As the letters flew between his supporters and hostile journals, Dombrowski rapidly vindicated himself in the eyes of the National Guard by virtue of his aggressive leadership. Prior to his appointment, a surprise assault by the Versailles soldiers established a dangerous bridgehead over the Marne River at Neuilly. This not only breached Paris's outer line of defenses but also provided the French Army with a strategic position from which to shell the city's inner line of forts. This reversal left the National Guard units around this key position greatly demoralized and thus vulnerable to further assaults. Receiving word of this situation upon his promotion, Dombrowski traveled to the endangered sector on April 8. Lissagaray, describing his arrival, relates how the disheartened National Guardsmen around Neuilly:

> beheld a young man, small of stature, in a modest uniform, slowly inspecting the vanguards in the thick of the fire…it was Dombrowski…Instead of the explosive glowing French bravery, he demonstrated the cool, and, as it were, unconscious courage of the Slav…in a few hours the new chief had conquered all his men.[101]

However, Dombrowski's plan consisted of more than restoring morale through personal leadership. The next night he ordered a night attack by two National Guard battalions against the Neuilly bridgehead. This attack proved enormously successful, driving the French Army back over the Marne and stabilizing Paris's eastern defenses. By the morning of April 12, a representative from the War Commission reported to the

[101]Lissagaray, 192.

Commune that Dombrowski had complete command of the situation and anticipated further advances.[102]

This vigorous action on Dombrowski's part further solidified his value in the eyes of the Commune's Executive Commission. Moreover, it removed any remaining questions among the National Guardsmen under his command regarding his loyalty or their willingness to serve under a Polish officer. In terms of ending the public's questions regarding Dombrowski, this victory proved less successful. As Lissagaray points out, "this brilliant attack was the deed of one man… (but) Paris was ignorant of this success."[103] Neuilly, though constituting a vital military position, stood over five miles from Paris's eastern edge. As related in the previous chapters, most Parisian radicals focused their attention on internal reforms or attacking unpopular governmental measures, such as Cluseret's effort to remove all men over the age of thirty-five from frontline National Guard battalions.[104] Despite a stream of steady reports published in the *Journal Officiel* throughout mid-April relating further advances and the capture of enemy colors, Dombrowski's vital contributions to the Commune's war effort, though furthering his own goals, remained largely unknown within Paris.[105]

Moreover, the lack of awareness regarding Dombrowski's military achievements opened him to attack from opponents who resented his rapid rise to command or preferred a different approach to Paris's defense. Division and petty back-biting proved

---

[102]*Le Journal Officiel*, April 12, 1871.
[103]Lissagaray, 193.
[104]See Edwards, 220.
[105] *Le Journal Officiel*, April 16, 1871. Dombrowski claimed one of the flags he captured belonged to the Papal Zouaves, whom most Communards believed to be fighting on Versailles' behalf. However, these units, which had fought the Prussians, had been disbanded in January 1871. Whether Dombrowski was mistaken or deliberately attempted to spur further anti-clerical sentiment in Paris is unclear.

one of the greatest detriments to the Commune's war effort in general, as various factions struggled for authority over the National Guard and overall military planning. Some of this conflict had its origins in the divisions between the Commune's ideological factions. However, personal ambitions and jealousies also drove these struggles among members of the Commune's political and military leadership. As a result, "the National Guard was never brought under any central control, maintaining its independence at the local level."[106] Though potentially fatal in the struggle against Versailles, the Commune's leaders unfortunately preferred to attack each other over command, rather than establishing it to any effective degree.

In Dombrowski's case, the first of these attacks focused unsurprisingly on the issue of his nationality, although institutional jealously constituted the real motive. His assailant in this matter was Emile Eudes, a Blanquist student with a long history of political activism during the Second Empire and strong connections with the Parisian radical movement. Following the March 26 Commune election, the new government promoted Eudes and several others to generals of the National Guard, despite a collective lack of any military experience. Indeed, Lissagaray asserts that Eudes, "being a member of the so-called party of action, owed this post only to the patronage of his old cronies."[107] The resulting disaster on April 3, as discussed above, led to his and his fellow's replacement by Dombrowski and other men with military experience, including several other Poles.

---

[106]Edwards, 221.
[107]Lissagaray, 164.

Eudes, eager to reestablish his position with the National Guard, used the April 20 meeting of the Commune to raise questions regarding so many foreigners serving in leadership roles. Addressing the council, he contended that, in trying to ascertain why the war effort was faltering, the fact that one-fourth of the military commanders were foreigners needed to be considered and explained to the people of Paris. He then began to list these foreigners, not surprisingly beginning with Dombrowski. Though acknowledging Eudes' point, several other representatives, including Dombrowski's associate Delescluze, implied that the military experience possessed by these foreigners was needed. Eudes, realizing his effort had failed, changed his target and focused the rest of his criticism indirectly on Cluseret, a much more acceptable target among his fellow Communards.[108] Though unsuccessful, Eudes' attack illustrates that Dombrowski, despite his continued service to the Commune, suffered from a political vulnerability due to his nationality, a vulnerability not shared by his French comrades. While most Communards resisted utilizing this line of attack, the worsening military situation, combined with the growing strength of the neo-Jacobins, meant that this was not the last time Dombrowski experienced assaults of this sort.

Despite the doubts cast on his loyalty by some fellow radicals, his effective military service, despite being underreported, did further his connections among some groups and individuals within the Commune. Louis Rossel, Cluseret's chief of staff, had supported Dombrowski's original appointment as Commandant and came to develop both a good working relationship with the Pole as a well as an admiration for his capacities. Rossel relates that as Cluseret "provided himself…inferior in his duties, in activity, in the

[108] *Procès-Verbaux de la Commune.* Vol I, 224–27.

power of taking lead and in capacity for organization," he and Dombrowski actively collaborated to keep the war effort from floundering further.[109] Members of the International's French Branch, with whom Dombrowski had long enjoyed amicable relations, also lauded his military efforts. Benoît Malon, observing from his position at the Commission of Labor and Exchange, asserted that Dombrowski's military service was proving him a "champion of the Revolution." Dismissing the charges by some neo-Jacobins that Dombrowski and his fellow foreign fighters proved a liability, Malon asserts that Dombrowski's and his comrades' efforts constituted a "precursor of the future République Universelle," which accepted "the assistance of all men…without concern about the nationality as citizens of world."[110] Elisabeth Dmitrieff, in her April 24 letter to Hermann Jung (a key member of the International's London-based General Council), praises Dombrowski's exertions, relating that he is "fighting well" despite the overall poor military leadership under the Commune.[111] Clearly the issue of Dombrowski's nationality, like those periodically raised against Leo Frankel and Elisabeth Dmitrieff, illustrate the still existing tension in Parisian radical circles between nationalist/patriotic conceptions inherited from 1792 and the universalistic/transnational principles first posited in 1789 and elaborated upon during the nineteenth century.

Despite these issues with some other Communard leaders, the strongest constituency Dombrowski developed under the Commune was that of the National Guard, particularly those units which served directly under him around Neuilly. This can

---

[109]Louis Rossel, *Rossel's Posthumous Papers*, tran, Unknown (London: Chapman and Hall, 1872), 83–84.
[110]Malon, 213.
[111]"Letter, Elisabeth Dmitrieff-Tomanovsky to Hermann Jung, April 24, 1871," *Lettres de communards*, 36–37.

be credited mostly to Dombrowski's military capacity. A representative of the Commune, sent to observe Dombrowski, reported back to the council on April 25 that the Polish offer enjoyed the "adoration" of his men, who viewed him as one of the few leaders invested in both victory and their well-being.[112] The depth of these soldiers' devotion was demonstrated by the so-called "105th Battalion Affair." As pressure increased on the Communard position at Neuilly in mid-April, Dombrowski required a constant stream of reinforcements. One of the units that he summoned to the front was the National Guard's 105th Battalion, which up to that point had remained within Paris proper. Despite receipt of repeated orders by Dombrowski to march to the front, the officers of this unit refused to obey. Finally, Dombrowski, along with a body of soldiers, travelled to the city and ordered the arrest and court martial of the 105th's officers. As mentioned above, the Commune's National Guard units repeatedly demonstrated their unwillingness to comply with orders in general and military discipline in particular. However, Dombrowski's status among the National Guard led to a rare instance of obedience, with the charged officers led off by their comrades to prison. Reporting to the Commune on April 25 Dombrowski, recognizing the likelihood of objections to a court martial, presented his case for the action. He argued that "if you do not take the necessary measures, all is lost," since discipline is necessary for a military to function. With an eye perhaps to his own popularity, he exonerated the soldiers themselves, stating "it is not against the guards that we must act, but against officers who do not want to fight and who prevent their men from fighting."[113] Rossel supported Dombrowski in this

[112]*Procès-Verbaux de la Commune,* vol 1, 468.
[113]Ibid, 474.

assessment, asserting "wild acts of indiscipline and rebellion" occur daily, thus it is necessary "to have recourse to energetic measures of coercion." Though several members of the Commune objected to such a court martial, the trial was held and Rossel, acting as the judge, cashiered the 105th's officers and disbanded the unit due to its soldiers' "collective cowardice."[114] Dombrowski's capacity to inspire normally undisciplined and highly independent National Guardsmen to accept such an outcome indicates the degree of regard they held for him.

Regardless of his men's esteem, Dombrowski's experiences on the front as April waned led to his growing questioning of the Commune's military leadership, specifically that of Cluseret. Many shared the Polish general's growing skepticism of the War Delegate. Rossel, in his capacity as chief of staff, believed by late April that events had overcome Cluseret and his lack of coordination of the Commune's forces placed Paris in grave danger.[115] The Commune itself developed a deepening suspicion both of Cluseret's capacity and his political intentions. On April 23, the Commune called him before a committee of inquiry to account for his handling of the war effort. One area in which they vigorously questioned him was on the requests by Dombrowski for reinforcements for Neuilly sent on both April 19 and April 20.[116] Though first assuring the committee that he "never once had the intention to refuse anything to General Dombrowski," Cluseret then offered an account that strongly implied that Dombrowski's requests were the product of unnecessary panic.[117] In his memoirs, he reinforced that

[114]Rossel, 85, 231.
[115]Ibid, 93–97.
[116]*Procès-Verbaux de la* Commune, vol 1, 289, 350.
[117]Ibid, 401–05.

point, asserting that Dombrowski's demands for reinforcements were an exaggeration on the Polish officer's part and failed to account for the overall military situation.[118]

Dombrowski, when apprised of Cluseret's views, expressed understandable resentment and became further convinced of the War Delegate's inability to command. Aware of the Commune's skepticism of Cluseret's assessment of events on the battlefield, Dombrowski continued to send the council a steady stream of dispatches describing the difficult military situation and requesting reinforcements. His report on April 28 presents a good example, emphasizing that while his soldiers continue to "persevere with courage and energy," unless his frequent calls for support were met, their bravery would come to naught.[119] Though still operating from Neuilly, associates within the city, as well as Rossel, clearly kept him abreast of the growing chorus within the Commune calling for Cluseret's removal. Moreover, these same sources would have informed him of the growing calls within the Commune for a new executive body, a Committee of Public Safety modeled upon the body granted near dictatorial powers to face the great revolutionary crisis in 1792. Nearly every discussion of this potential committee placed Dombrowski's comrade Delescluze at its head.

In assessing Dombrowski's motivations for joining those pressing for Cluseret's removal as War Delegate, there is no evidence to indicate that political jockeying drove his actions. Events would show that after Cluseret's removal, Dombrowski made no attempts to push for higher command and remained focused primarily on the Commune's military effort. Following his appointment as Commandant of Paris in early April, he

---

[118]Cluseret, 176, 180.
[119]*Journal Officiel,* April 29, 1871.

remained primarily at the front, making only an occasional appearance in the city itself at the Ministry of War. Given these circumstances, Dombrowski's involvement in Cluseret's removal must be seen as primarily driven by his devotion to the Commune's ultimate success on the battlefield. For without Paris's deliverance, the hope of a Poland liberated by the armies of the République Universelle stood little chance of being realized.

Ultimately, Dombrowski's dispatch of April 28 corresponded with a series of events that accelerated Cluseret's dismissal. His plea for reinforcements arrived at the Commune during a stormy session focused on the ineptitude of Cluseret's leadership and a growing fear regarding his political intentions. Several Commune members accused Cluseret of plotting to emulate Bonaparte and establish a military dictatorship. [120] On the following evening, the Commune summoned Rossel to their meeting and made it very clear to the chief of staff that Cluseret's days were numbered. However, a final military crisis on April 30 prompted the final drop of the axe, as Fort d'Issy, the linchpin of the Commune's southwestern defenses, was abandoned that morning in the face of a heavy Versailles bombardment. Ironically, Cluseret, unaware of the level of discontent within the Commune's leadership, moved rapidly to the fortress with reinforcements and managed to recapture it that evening. However, Cluseret's final act as the Commune's War Delegate occurred as the Commune itself met and decided, based on the dire

[120] *Procès-Verbaux de la Commune*, vol 1, 550–55.

military situation, both to establish a Committee of Public Safety and to order Cluseret's removal from command and his arrest.[121]

Dombrowski viewed Cluseret's dismissal with optimism, believing that his inability to coordinate the Commune's war effort had greatly hindered its cause. He was equally optimistic, at least initially, with the appointment of Rossel as the new War Delegate on April 30. Speaking to Wolowski, who crossed the battle lines briefly in early May, Dombrowski stated that of all the Commune's French generals, "only Rossel is capable."[122] The next day Rossel summoned his commanders, including Dombrowski, to the War Ministry. There he proposed a reorganization of the National Guard, aimed at providing a cadre of trained and disciplined soldiers for offensive operations. Dombrowski, Wroblewski, and several other experienced officers would lead this new unit of 2,000 men as it operated a sort of military fire brigade, stabilizing problematic areas in the Communard lines and, more importantly, identifying weak positions within the enemy lines to assault. Recognizing that a completely defensive posture meant inevitable defeat, Rossel felt this new initiative was vital to the Commune's future. Dombrowski, for his part, enthusiastically supported this rationalization of the war effort, recognizing that the previous approach had produced only steady gains for the Versailles Army.[123]

---

[121]Ibid., 578–80. Cluseret was placed in prison and held for court martial. However, the entry of the Versailles forces allowed him to escape on May 24 and he eventually found his way to London.
[122]Wolowski, 87. It appears that Wolowski's Polish citizenship, as well as connections he enjoyed in both Paris and Versailles, allowed him to travel in and out of the capital without major issues. In his account he reproduces his passes from both Versailles and the Commune. See 93–95.
[123]Rossel, 103–04.

However, the political discord among the Commune's higher echelons proved a great hindrance to these military reform efforts. Dombrowski, Rossel, and other military leaders initially favored the Committee of Public Safety's creation, not due to any ideological approval but rather because they hoped it would bring greater centralization and support to the war effort. This proved anything but the case as the Commune's council, the Committee of Public Safety, and the various National Guard committees all attempted to participate in directing military policy. This created a state of affairs that unsurprisingly resulted in not the greater focus Dombrowski had hoped for but chaos.[124]

Another crisis at Fort d'Issy illustrated the consequences of the Commune's divided authority. Upon assuming command Rossel dispatched the revolutionary blowhard Eudes to take command of the vital fortress. Having become the central point of the Versailles thrust to break Paris's defense line, Fort d'Issy experienced nearly constant bombardment. Faced with this intensity, Eudes, on the pretense of seeking reinforcement at the War Ministry, set out for Paris, leaving the fort in his chief of staff's command.[125] Made aware of this threat, the Committee of Public Safety sent a message to Dombrowski at Neuilly on May 3, vesting him with command of all the Commune's field forces. Rushing to take control of the situation at Fort d'Issy, Dombrowski encountered Rossel, who, according to the latter, "was as astonished by my arrival as I had been by his presence." Dombrowski, who had been informed by the Committee that Rossel's future role as War Delegate would be purely administrative, discovered that Rossel possessed no knowledge of the change. The two men, being, in Rossel's words,

[124]Addressed by Edwards, 235–40; and Horne, 329–35.
[125]Lissagaray, 248.

"on the most amicable terms," shared a piece of bread in the fort's dugout and agreed to cooperate in their efforts.[126]

However, Rossel, upon returning to the War Ministry, immediately sent a letter to Charles Gérardin, a close friend and member of the Committee of Public Safety, and demanded that the lines of command be clarified. Rossel, writing later, asserts that despite admiring Dombrowski's tactical abilities greatly, he believed that the Polish General lacked the capacity to control all parts of the front. However, in an address to the Commune the following day, he framed his argument differently by emphasizing how overall command drew Dombrowski's essential leadership away from the threatened sector at Neuilly. Pyat, addressing the Commune on the behalf of the Committee of Public Safety, responded that no order beyond sending Dombrowski to d'Issy to deal with the immediate crisis had been issued. Despite this denial, Pyat's subsequent actions toward Rossel, coupled with his and Delescluze's established support of Dombrowski, strongly indicate that the Committee did indeed issue the Polish officer's promotion on May 3. However, Rossel's spirited response, coupled with the Commune's reaction, caused them to backpedal and reconfirm Rossel's overall command.[127]

Informed on May 5 that Rossel retained overall control of the Commune's field forces, Dombrowski, though cooling somewhat toward Rossel, resumed his focus on the fighting west of Paris. However, this experience robbed him of much of his enthusiasm that Cluseret's removal would lead to a more unified and well-directed war effort. Lissagaray relates that "Dombrowski, weary of struggling against the inertness of the

---

[126]Rossel, 108.
[127]*Procès-Verbaux de la Commune,* vol 2, 141–50; and Rossel, 109.

War Office, was discouraged," a condition that likely worsened as new calls for the Neuilly sector's reinforcement produced only a trickle of National Guardsmen.[128] Speaking to Wolowski on the matter, he related that every intervention by the Commune resulted in "a new chaos."[129] While these constituted reasons for questioning the Commune's military planning, the government's treatment of Dombrowski's commander-in-chief Rossel only gave rise to greater doubts. Unable to get the various National Guard committees to agree to his reorganization effort and faced with various intrigues from the Committee of Public Safety, Rossel tendered his resignation on May 9, just as Fort d'Issy fell to Versailles. That evening Dombrowski dined with Rossel. During the meal they received a proposal from the National Guard committee asking that the two men take control of its battalions to overthrow both the Commune and Committee of Public Safety. Arguing that drastic action was needed to save Paris, these agents contended that "nothing of worth could be expected any more from those talkers on the Commune."[130] Despite their disillusionment with the government, both men refused the offer. The next day Rossel was summoned before the Commune and threatened with court martial; however, he disappeared that evening before he could be arrested.[131] Given his already declining view of the Commune's political leadership, the treatment of Rossel, coupled with the National Guard's proposed coup, likely did little to reassure Dombrowski.

---

[128]Lissagaray, 306.
[129]Wolowski, 88.
[130]Rossel, 122–23; and Gaston da Costa, *La Commune Vécue: 18 mars–28 mai 1871*(Paris: Ancienne Maison, 1905), 196. A young Blanquist, da Costa served Raoul Rigault at the Prefecture of Police until the Commune's end before escaping abroad.
[131]Unable to escape France following the Commune's fall, Rossel was arrested in June and, following a "trial," executed by Versailles in November 1871. See Edwards, 347.

Nevertheless, he continued to serve the Commune in the field, accepting from Delescluze, who replaced Rossel as War Delegate, command of all forces on the right bank of the Seine. His fellow Pole Wroblewski was to control those forces on the left bank.[132] While dealing with this new military obligation, Dombrowski took some time on May 10 or 11 to speak with Wolowski, who had recently crossed the lines from Versailles. This conversation, which Wolowski recorded, provides vital insight into Dombrowski's thinking regarding the war effort, the Commune, and his broader political goals as the military crisis facing Paris worsened.

Unsurprisingly, given his experiences, Dombrowski spends a substantial amount of time offering Wolowski a stinging critique of the Commune's war effort. Though he acknowledges the hard fighting done by most National Guardsmen, he bemoans the utter lack of discipline and his inability to instill it due to the constant interference of the Commune. He relates that every attempt to "punish cowards in his army" comes to naught because each of them "has a friend or a cousin in the Commune" who refutes the charges and reproaches Dombrowski for making attacks on "such great patriots." Moving on to the Commune itself, he asserts that they "do not have a penny for practicality or any military knowledge," which routinely resulted in contradictory orders that produce military chaos. He further adds that since he is Polish, he must suffer this since his criticism will be perceived highly critically or even as a sign of treason. However, though offering this biting critique, Dombrowski does assure Wolowski that the Commune's actions are a result of "ignorance rather than ill will."[133]

---

[132]*Procès-Verbaux de la Commune,* vol 2, 194.
[133]Wolowski, 86–88.

However, when asked by Wolowski why he continued to serve in the face of this incompetence, Dombrowski offered a response that demonstrates his continued devotion to the Commune and the larger implications of its struggle. Questioned about why a Pole should participate in this French Civil War, Dombrowski responded that his and his fellow émigrés' service showed Europe's great powers that "an alliance of poor nations" can indeed resist any one of them, illustrated by the Commune and its Polish volunteers' resistance to the French Army for the past two months. Building upon this, he argued that Paris presents the ideal point to challenge the established order. Drawing on the case he developed months before against Trochu, Dombrowski asserted that Paris is not Bucharest or Madrid; here "we have everything we need to make war." Moreover, Paris's war against Versailles, unlike a conflict on Europe's periphery, possessed a much higher probability of spurring similar uprisings elsewhere. Dombrowski, invoking both the French Revolution and 1848, notes that history demonstrates Paris's capacity to export revolution. Ultimately though, Dombrowski's continued loyalty and willingness to die for the Commune's cause stem from his belief in its principles. He closes his discussion with Wolowski by asserting that "the Parisians want for themselves communal freedoms which will be the basis of all future liberties within Europe."[134] Dombrowski's discussion with Wolowski shows that despite his disillusionment with the Commune's war effort, even at this late date the Polish officer still viewed a victory at Paris as the best means of achieving a revolutionary tide that would realize his goal of a free Poland beneath the République Universelle's banner.

[134]Ibid, 90–92.

While Dombrowski's support of the Commune's cause largely manifested itself on the battlefield, another event in early May allowed him to demonstrate his fidelity in a different arena. Though early May brought steadily military gains, the Versailles Government began examining different means of accelerating Paris's fall. Subversion offered one potential avenue, and the Versailles government employed agents offering bribes to various National Guard officers in the hopes of attaining an unopposed entry through the city's defenses. Given his prominence among the Commune's field officers and his foreign background, Dombrowski made an obvious target. To this end, Thiers's chief of staff, Jules Barthelemy-Saint-Hilaire, hired Georges Veysset to approach the Polish officer about arranging for Paris's fall. The plan called either for purchasing Dombrowski's cooperation or creating enough suspicion around him to turn the Commune against him, thus removing its best officer from the field.[135]

Veysset first contacted one of Dombrowski's adjutants, who passed the offer to meet and discuss conditions to the general. Upon receiving this information, he went immediately to the Committee of Public Safety, which ordered him to set up a rendezvous with the agent. Dombrowski, agreeing to their request, also suggested allowing some portion of the Versailles Army into the city so that an ambush could be arranged. Given the potential for disaster, the Committee refused his request. Following Dombrowski's reply, Veysset set up a meeting for the night of May 12 in Montmartre. Trailed by Raoul Rigault's police agents, Dombrowski rendezvoused with Veysset, who offered him full amnesty and one million francs in exchange for his cooperation.

---

[135]A larger discussion of Versailles's unconventional war against the Commune can be found in Gordon Wright, "The Anti-Commune: Paris, 1871," *French Historical Studies* 10, no. 1 (Spring, 1977): 149–72.

Signaled by Dombrowski, the Commune's agents then moved in and arrested Veysset, who was subsequently shot and thrown into the Seine on May 22.[136] For most members of the Committee of Public Safety and the Communal Council Dombrowski's prompt reporting and cooperation in capturing this Versailles spy further validated his loyalty. However, among those neo-Jacobins who already viewed him with suspicion, this event served to reignite questions surrounding Dombrowski's nationality and thus his loyalty to the Commune's cause. Thus, despite once again acting in the Commune's best interest, Dombrowski found himself under a cloud that lingered in the minds of some Parisians even beyond his death.[137]

The thwarting of Versailles' attempt to enter the city by subterfuge unfortunately provided Paris only a short respite, as the French Army drove closer and closer to the city itself. In order to address this growing catastrophe, Delescluze called the Commune's leading generals to a Council of War on May 17. Despite the dire military situation, Dombrowski, the most senior officer present, presented a plan to renew the war effort and reverse the gains made by Versailles. Once again drawing on the blueprint he had devised during the Prussian siege, Dombrowski called for an emergency mass mobilization of the city's entire male population. Hoping to draw 100,000 men, he argued that by throwing these forces at the most heavily threatened points in Paris's defenses (which, since the fall of Fort d'Issy, lay mainly in the south) the situation could

---

[136]Lissagaray, 268–69, 478. In his appendix, Lissagaray produces a personal account of the affair sent to him by an unnamed former member of the Committee of Public Safety. Malon, 301, also presents an account of the incident, though he incorrectly claims Dombrowski was offered 1.5 million francs and the money had been forwarded by the Rothschilds.

[137]One of Wolowski's main intentions in writing *Dombrowski et Versailles* was to refute the lingering rumors that he had betrayed the Commune in its final days. Large portions of his work focus on meeting with former Versailles officials to demonstrate the falseness of these charges. See 97–110.

be stabilized long enough to develop a long-term plan to break the siege. Though this plan bore the hallmarks of desperation, it demonstrates Dombrowski's continued commitment to the Commune's cause even when faced with a military situation he surely recognized as nearly impossible. Ultimately, the logistics involved with such a mobilization led the Council to dismiss Dombrowski's suggestion. After debating a few other proposals and reaching no agreement, Dombrowski and his fellow returned to their units with orders to preserve the situation as best they could.[138]

Unfortunately, the odds arrayed against the Commune by late May assured that Dombrowski and his comrades' capacity to preserve the situation would be brief. Only four days after their Council of War, the Versailles Army discovered an unguarded gate into Paris at the Porte de Saint-Cloud and began advancing into the city. Learning of the breech, Dombrowski sent a message to the Committee of Public Safety, which was in mid-session, reporting on the situation. This document, though recognizing the breakthrough as a "serious event," demonstrated a coolness and even optimism on Dombrowski's part. Encouraging the Committee to "keep their composure," he assured them that "nothing is yet lost" and if reinforcements were rapidly dispatched, "everything will be saved."[139]

The Committee and the Commune's reaction to Dombrowski call was largely paralysis; no reinforcements would be forthcoming and, following the pattern of leadership Dombrowski had experienced since the war's beginning, all authority

---

[138]The order summoning Dombrowski and his fellow officers to the Council of War is printed in both *Procès-Verbaux de la Commune,*vol 2, 412; and *Le Journal Officiel*, May 18, 1871. An account of the meeting itself appears in Lissagaray, 285–86.

[139]*Procès-Verbaux de la Commune,* vol 2, 511.

fragmented. Despite this reality, the Polish general, still committed to both the Commune and the larger cause it represented, attempted to plug the breech on the morning of May 22. However, the 1500 or so National Guardsmen he assembled rapidly broke, leaving Dombrowski to flee in order to avoid capture. Attempting to make his way to the Hôtel de Ville, the Polish officer found himself arrested by a National Guard staff officer (who was shot only a day later for cowardice) and charged with treason for trying to flee. When Dombrowski was brought before a horrified Committee of Public Safety, its members ordered his immediate release. Delescluze and others attempted to assuage the general; however, the damage had been done. Lissagaray relates that Dombrowski kept repeating in "bitter despair" that "the Committee of Public Safety takes me for a traitor! My life belongs to the Commune!"[140] Having devoted himself to the Commune's cause in the hopes that its promise of a République Universelle would liberate Poland and the rest of Europe, Jaroslav Dombrowski, shattered by the false perception of his betrayal of those values, nevertheless prepared himself to offer his last measure of devotion to that cause.

The next morning, his old comrade Delescluze suggested he "do his best" in Montmartre, by then the scene of intense fighting. Lissagaray, describing the Polish soldier as he left the Hôtel de Ville, saw him leave "without hope, without soldiers, suspected since the entry of the Versaillese, all Dombrowski could do was die."[141] Arriving in Montmartre, he moved toward the most intense fighting around Rue Myrrha. Elisabeth Dmitrieff and Louise Michel, commanding a group of women manning the

[140]Malon, 399–401; and Lissagaray, 313, 323.
[141]Ibid, 333.

barricades, saw him as he advanced toward the front line. Michel relates as she approached him, he held out both his hands to her and said "[i]t's over." Moments later, he fell, mortally wounded.[142] Taken to Lariboisière Hospital, he expired two hours later. According to Wolowski, his last words to the attending doctor were "and they dare believe me a traitor."[143] Despite the battle raging throughout the city, a group of National Guardsmen bore his body to the Place de Bastille where a brief service was held. Afterward, the Guardsmen wrapped Dombrowski's body in a red flag and conveyed it to Père Lachaise for burial.[144]

For Jaroslav Dombrowski, the road to a free Poland must begin with the victory of the Paris Commune. Devoted to the cause of Polish liberation, his time as an exile in Paris during the 1860s brought him into contact with the French capital's diverse transnational radical community, an interaction that led him to a gradual reconception of his vision of national liberation. By the Commune's founding in March 1871, Dombrowski, by virtue of his experiences and exchanges with the different ideological perspective found in Paris, viewed Polish liberation as best achieved through the Commune's success and the export of its model of a democratic and social republic. To this end, he offered his military services to the Communard cause.

During his time as one of the Commune's highest ranking officers, Dombrowski experienced ineffectiveness and outright incompetence prompted in large part by political infighting that undercut Paris's war effort. His position as a foreign national was utilized by some military rivals to criticize both his fitness to command and his loyalty to the

[142]Louise Michel, *Mémoires* (Arles: Editions Sulliver, 1998), 67.
[143]Wolowski, 128.
[144]Lissagaray, 342–43.

Communard cause. However, his effective leadership, his established connections with other radicals, and the loyalty of his soldiers undercut most of these criticisms until the Commune's final days. During those last frantic hours opponents once again asserted the charges against Dombrowski's loyalty, leading him to seek acquittal by personal sacrifice, at which he succeeded. Jaroslav Dombrowski, like his non-French comrades Leo Frankel and Elisabeth Dmitrieff, came to view Paris and its Commune as a point of departure, a site where a victorious revolution could provide the means of achieving not only a free Paris but also a free, democratic, and social Poland as well.

Epilogue: A Parisian Sunset

The Revolutionary Capital Falls

After surveying Paris's fire-gutted buildings and corpse-strewn streets in the Commune's immediate aftermath, the writer and art critic Edmond de Goncourt attempted to place the enormous loss of life in perspective. No friend of the Commune, he characterized its violent suppression by the Army as a necessary evil, asserting that "the bloodletting was a bleeding white" which would "by killing off the combative part of the population defer the next revolution by a whole generation."[1] His bourgeois callousness aside, these words proved prophetic. The Commune's brutal defeat ended Paris's reign as the Continent's crucible of revolutionary thought and action, extinguishing in the eyes of international radicals that Promethean flame they had hoped would set Europe and the world ablaze. Though Paris's boulevards and cafés soon echoed again with the different tongues of new generations of expatriates, exiles, and sojourners, including political refugees of various stripes, few, if any, viewed the French capital as the revolutionary means of realizing their own ideological ends.

The utter devastation wrought by the French Army during the Commune's last week, coupled with the witch hunt that followed, shattered both Paris's national and transnational radical communities. Estimates vary, but somewhere between 20,000 and 30,000 Communards died or were executed as the French Army recaptured and secured the capital.[2] This constituted, in little more than a week, the bloodiest civil violence

---

[1]Edmond de Goncourt, *Paris under siege, 1870–1871: From the Goncourt Journal*, ed. George Becker (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), 312.

[2]Edwards, 346, estimates 20,000 dead, a figure that Tombs, 180, does not dispute. Both scholars appear to be basing their estimates on Lissagaray, 308–09, who puts forth the figure of between 17,000 and 20,000

experienced by any European state during the long nineteenth century. Stuart Edwards places these figures in even starker relief, noting that they eclipse those recorded executed throughout all of France during the entirety of the Great Revolution's "Terror," a span of eighteen months.[3] A massive wave of arrests compounded the casualties list, with over 40,000 "suspects" being hauled off to makeshift prison camps, coastal fortresses, and prison barges by the end of June. Over the next two years military tribunals convicted 10,000 men and women in what Jacques Rougerie deemed the greatest repressive enterprise in French history. While most faced various prison sentences within France, 4,000 deemed the most politically dangerous, including the "Red Virgin" Louise Michel, found themselves shipped to a South Pacific penal colony on New Caledonia. Given the bloody work already conducted during the Commune's fall, French tribunals sentenced only ninety-eight to death, of which twenty-three were actually executed.[4]

Those radicals fortunate enough to escape the Versailles Government's vengeance found themselves political refugees, dogged not just by French authorities but those of other hostile governments, particularly Russia. Only England and Switzerland offered truly safe harbor. In the months following the Commune's defeat, hundreds gathered in London, assured by the Gladstone government's stated unwillingness to extradite former Communards to France. Equally important was the presence of the International in the English capital, which held the promise of material and financial aid. The demands of

---

dead. However, Rougerie in *Paris Insurgé*, 257, claims, based on comparing population and demographic information from 1870 and 1872, that the number killed could be as high as 30,000.

[3]Edwards, 346. He carefully qualifies this claim regarding deaths during the Terror by asserting these numbers only reflect those officially executed, not those who died in prison or were killed without trial.

[4]Tombs, 180–81.

these exiled Communards soon overwhelmed the General Council's limited resources, prompting Marx to ask for aid from Internationalists as far away as Washington, D.C., to contend with the "great distress among the refugees here…without the means of subsistence…there is to be an appeal issued to your workingmen which we trust will be liberally responded to."[5] However, this initial solidarity faded as the exiles began trading barbs over the Commune's failures. Some, disillusioned and traumatized, dropped out of politics completely and focused on more mundane pursuits, such as offering London's elites private tutoring in French.[6] The Parisian radical diaspora produced by the Commune's defeat, rather than preserving a unity of purpose based on shared experiences, was largely atomized over the course of the 1870s. For surviving non-French Communards, this meant the dissolution of many networks that had tied them to Paris's revolutionary community and traditions.

Meanwhile Paris, under the ultraconservative Versailles Government, found itself subjected to a massive attempt to purge the revolutionary tradition that had drawn so many international radicals since 1789. The National Guard, which had provided the Commune's main source of military strength and had its origins in 1789, was dissolved in favor of a large regular army garrison and a military governor. Several new laws limited any radical political activities within the city, including the 1872 Dufaure Law that banned the International. Foreigners, regardless of political ties, found themselves subjected to intense police scrutiny. Given the prominence of non-French radicals in the Commune, any hint of connection with the Left brought about rapid deportation. Paris

[5]"Letter, Karl Marx to Hermann Meyer, August 25, 1871," in *Collected Works 44*, 208.
[6]Edwards, 349.

also found itself stripped of self-government, and the office of mayor was abolished. This state of affairs continued while the city remained under martial law, which was not lifted until April 1876.[7] These conditions, coupled with the deaths, arrests, and exiles that followed the Commune, caused nearly all existing Parisian radical networks, with their French and non-French components, to atrophy rapidly.

The scope of these efforts to efface Paris's revolutionary legacy went far beyond mere political repression. The conservative order also attempted to erase physical spaces associated with the Commune and other moments from Paris's revolutionary past. Perhaps the most dramatic example of this process came with the decision to erect Sacré-Cœur on the heights of Montmartre, the site universally identified with the Revolution of March 18 and the Commune's birth. Proposed initially as a memorial to Archbishop Georges Darboy, shot along with seventy-two other hostages (including forty-four members of the clergy) during the Commune's final hours, the monarchist-dominated Assembly enthusiastically gave its support, seeing a basilica dedicated "in witness of repentance"[8] as the perfect means to render Montmartre unhallowed for radicals. Though construction began in 1875, fierce opposition from both radicals and republicans slowed the process to a crawl. However, the basilica was ultimately completed in 1919, an idol to the conservative-clerical alliance opposed by the Communards and nearly all Parisian radicals movements back to 1789.[9]

---

[7]Shafer, 183–84.
[8]Horne, 422.
[9]A detailed discussion of both the history, spatial issues, and symbolic importance of the construction of Sacré-Cœur can be found in David Harvey, *Paris, Capital of Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 311–30.

However, repression alone did not quench the revolutionary fire that had driven Paris's French and international radicals. By 1875, France appeared in danger of being returned to monarchy of one shade or another by the deeply conservative Versailles Government. Faced with this threat, many former Communards not in exile made common cause with the Republicans in their ultimately successful effort to establish the Third Republic. This willingness of many former Parisian radicals to work with the Republicans became more apparent after the latter oversaw the passage of an Amnesty Bill for former Communards in June 1880.[10] While some radicals returning from exile, such as Louis Michel, remained unrepentantly hostile to the French government, most prominent former Communards, as Robert Tombs notes, "took their places on the Left of the republican spectrum: they neither shunned it, nor were shunned by it."[11] Benoît Malon, who collaborated closely with both Leo Frankel and Elisabeth Dmitrieff during the Commune, presents a notable example. Amnestied in 1880, by the end of that decade Malon became a leading figure among the Possibilists, whose emphasis on promoting socialist reform through the ballot box garnered huge support among the Parisian working class.[12] Though largely still committed to Leftist politics of some sort, most former French Communards concluded that they could live with the new Republic and work within the political parameters it established. This new political reality further limited the revolutionary appeal that had so long drawn the Continent's disillusioned radicals to the city.

---

[10]Shafer, 183.
[11]Tombs, 189.
[12]Vincent, 108–19.

Developments within Europe's transnational radical movement also contributed to Paris's post-Commune decline as a revolutionary center. At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, Marx wrote a lengthy letter to Engels, asserting that:

> If the Prussians win, then centralization of the state power will be beneficial for the centralization of the German working class. German predominance would then shift the center of gravity of the West European workers' movement from France to Germany, and you need only compare developments in the two countries from 1866 to the present day to realize that the German working class is superior to the French both in theory and organization. Its predominance over the French on the international stage would also mean the predominance of our theory over Proudhon's, etc.[13]

The destruction of Paris's radical movement during the Commune greatly accelerated this process. As Stuart Edwards notes, "the period from the Commune to the Russian Revolution was marked by the predominance of the German social democratic ideology, which paralleled the political and economic domination of Germany in Europe."[14] Though most transnational socialists joined Marx in hailing the Communards as martyrs, invoking their memory as a rallying cry for radicals everywhere, most post-1871 international radicals had very little use for France's remaining Leftist leaders. The real giants of European transnational radicalism, as Edwards further contends, were almost exclusively German: Marx; Engels; August Bebel; Wilhelm Liebknecht; and (later) Karl Kautsky.[15] While the Kaiserreich's repressive nature prevented Berlin from physically replacing Paris as Europe's revolutionary capital, there is little doubt that by the late 1870s most transnational radicals looked to Germany as the best means of facilitating their ideological visions. This state of affairs continued until Europe's revolutionary

---

[13]"Letter, Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels," July 20, 1870, *Collected Works 44,* 3–4.
[14]Edwards, 354.
[15]Ibid.

centrum took its final eastward shift in 1917, with the Bolsheviks and their successors establishing Moscow as the transnational capital of the twentieth century's truly global radical movement. For the Communists, Paris, with its Great Revolution and Commune, constituted only two key historical steps in the great march toward socialism.

After the Commune: Jaroslav Dombrowski, Elisabeth Dmitrieff, and Leo Frankel

Though the Commune's defeat largely marked the end of Paris's active role as Europe's revolutionary center, this does not mean that the city's revolutionary legacy disappeared from French and non-French radical collective memory. Indeed, Jaroslav Dombrowski's death during the Commune's final days contributed to the sanctification of a radical site of commemoration that would in the decades following 1871 present an ideological rival to Sacré-Cœur. On May 24, as fierce fighting raged throughout Paris, a solemn procession bearing Dombrowski's body moved through the city's eastern districts. As it passed through the Place de la Bastille, it halted so that dozens of National Guardsmen bearing torches could pay tribute to the fallen General before returning to battle. Prior to Dombrowski's burial in Père Lachaise, Auguste Vermorel, who had known Dombrowski since the mid-1860s and had been beside him as he died, delivered a defiant funeral oration, declaring "this is he whom they accused of treachery! He has been one of the first to give his life for the Commune…let us swear to leave this place only to die!"[16]

However, as the fighting continued, Père Lachaise became a site where many of Paris's defenders came or were taken to meet their fate. On May 28, the final day of organized resistance, a group of National Guardsmen made their last stand among its

[16]Quoted in Edward, 323. Vermorel himself would be horribly wounded a few days later and subsequently die in a prison cell in Versailles after French officers refused to provide him with any medical treatment.

tombs and monuments. Ultimately overcome by superior numbers, those who surrendered were taken by French army soldiers to the eastern wall of the cemetery and shot. This wall was used repeatedly as a site of execution by the Versaillaise soldiers over the ensuing days, with hundreds shot at the site and then buried where they fell.[17]

This bloody legacy, within less than a decade, transformed Père Lachaise into a site of pilgrimage and remembrance that in part provided a radical response to Sacré-Cœur. In 1880, following the Third Republic's passage of a general amnesty, Paris radicals organized a march in the Commune's memory to Père Lachaise, ending at the wall where the mass shootings had occurred. Much to the discomfort of the police, over 25,000 Parisian radicals turned out for the May 23 demonstration, which ended with a solemn ceremony at what was christened (and remains) the Mur des Fédérés.[18]

This procession became a yearly ritual for the French Left, drawing crowds in the tens of thousands well into the mid twentieth century. Initially undertaken as an act of defiance by survivors of the barricades, the processions to Père Lachaise in the immediate post-Commune period served to illustrate that revolutionary memory still constituted a contested ground even in Paris's post-revolutionary era. However, over the ensuing decades the ritual became more an act of remembrance as Paris's revolutionary fires further cooled. Since the late 1980s the yearly marches to the Wall draw only a few dozen radicals,[19] usually greatly outnumbered by tourists pausing to snap a photograph of the procession before setting off in search of the Doors' lead singer Jim Morrison's grave.

---

[17]Tombs, 195.
[18]Edwards, 350.
[19]Tombs, 197.

Remembrance of Dombrowski has followed a similar historical pattern. Soon after the Commune's defeat, several of his former soldiers gathering to honor their general discovered that no marker had been left at his burial site. Indeed, Dombrowski's grave has never been identified or discovered. However, a small monument was erected near the Mur des Fédérés in the early 1880s and his memory figured prominently in the yearly ceremonies at the site for several decades afterward.[20] His name apparently remained current enough in French radical circles for a battalion of French socialists and Communists volunteering for the Republican cause during the Spanish Civil War to name their unit in his honor.[21] However, with the decline of Communism, the Commune, as Tombs notes, "is no longer politically contentious," rendering most its participants ideologically inert.[22] In this environment Dombrowski's name has largely faded from Paris's collective historical memory, only making brief appearances during moments of historical commemoration, such as during the Commune 140th Anniversary in 2011.[23]

The post-1871 lives of Elisabeth Dmitrieff and Leo Frankel, survivors of the Commune's violent suppression, reflect in many ways the ideological shifts and disillusionment that more immediately followed Paris's demise as Europe's revolutionary capital. Despite being wounded on the barricades, the two managed together to slip out of Paris. Employing their fluency in German, the two posed as bourgeois Prussians and

---

[20]Dubois, *A l'assaut du ciel*, 258–59.
[21]Ken Bradley, *International Brigades in Spain, 1936–39* (Oxford: Osprey, 1994), 49.
[22]Tombs, 197.
[23]A small gathering was held in Dombrowski's memory in May 2011 at the site of his death on rue Myrha. See "Les questions posées par les communards sont encore d'actualité*," Libération*, November 25, 2010. http://www.liberation.fr/livres/2010/11/22/les-questions-posees-par-les-communards-sont-encore-d-actualite_695447.

thus managed to slip into Switzerland by late June.[24] Welcomed along with other fleeing Communards by Geneva's radical community, Frankel and Dmitrieff recovered from their wounds while avoiding Swiss authorities, who had been formally asked by the French government in early July to arrest and extradite both Frankel and "a woman named Elise."[25] Their paths ultimately diverged in August 1871, when a still deeply distraught Dmitrieff refused Frankel's request to accompany him back to London and the International's General Council.[26]

The failure of the Commune appeared to limit greatly Dmitrieff's further interest in transnational radicalism. Several scholars, including Eichner, Braibant, Singer-Lecocq, and McClellan, suggest that Dmitrieff resented the lack of support provided by the International's General Council and other radicals to the Communards, leading her to turn her back on non-Russian politics.[27] The evidence seems to support this conclusion, as Dmitrieff, once again Tomonovskaya, arrived back in Russia in October 1871 and remained there for the rest of her life.[28] While attempting to reintegrate into the Russian radical community in 1872, she met Ivan Mikhailovitch Davidovsky, an employee of her former husband who combined elite radicalism with various criminal enterprises. The two fell in love and married, eventually having two children. Davidovsky's political and criminal schemes led to him being charged with murder, fraud, embezzlement, and other crimes in 1876. Found guilty on all accounts, the Russian government sentenced

---

[24]Eichner, 153.
[25]Martin R. Waldman, "The Revolutionary as Criminal in 19th Century France: A Study of Communards and Deportees," *Science and Society XXXVII*, no. 1 (1973): 31-55, at 40.
[26]Singer-Lecocq, 173–74.
[27]Eichner, 157–58; Braibant, 184; Singer-Lecocq, 190; and McClellan, 171.
[28]The dropping of Dmitrieff served to frustrate French efforts to locate her or even definitely identify her, though "the woman named Dmitrieff" was sentenced to imprisonment in a walled fortress in October 1872. See Eichner, 155.

Davidovsky to permanent exile in Siberia. Dmitrieff joined him, along with their children, in Atchinsk.[29]

Since Dmitrieff hid her political past and her husband's sentence deemed him a common criminal, the political exile community in Siberia refused any contact with the two. While her relationships with other male radicals during the Commune had facilitated her work and allowed her to overcome the constraints placed upon her gender, ironically in this situation it was her relationship with a male that prevented her from establishing ties to Siberia's radical networks. Faced with this new reality, Dmitrieff during the 1880s became deeply committed to the Orthodox faith as well as the study of astronomy, tutoring local children in the latter.[30] Sources become scarce by the 1890s, but seem to indicate Dmitrieff left her husband with her daughters around 1900 for Moscow. However, though several addresses for the three have been found, no evidence exists of her further involvement in radical politics during either the Revolutions of 1905 or 1917. Indeed, even Soviet sources fail to establish her specific date of death, estimating it to be 1918.[31] It appears that for Elisabeth Dmitrieff the failure of Paris's transnational revolutionary promise led to an abandonment of her radical project, a state of affairs that in many ways mirrors the French capital itself post-1871. As Carolyn Eichner concludes, the Commune's defeat "pushed Dmitrieff to a point where she released her political self, and looked instead to less concrete, less earthly pursuits…both

[29]Ibid, 157–61.
[30]Ibid, 161.
[31]Braibant, 219–22; Singer-Lecocq, 221–24.

faith and the stars stood outside of…her control…she made no effort to influence or reorder either one."[32]

If Dmitrieff's post-Commune life parallels Paris's post-1871 move away from its revolutionary mission, Leo Frankel's reflects the continued vibrancy of European transnational radicalism in post-Parisian focused era. Frankel, soon after his arrival in London in August 1871, found himself elected to the International's General Council as a representative of the Austrian-Hungarian workers.[33] Frankel proved extremely loyal to Marx and Engels during their struggle with Bakunin and his faction during the Hague Conference in September 1872. Beginning in 1875, Frankel began a decade-long effort to organize workers in both Austria and Hungary. Arrested after his initial arrival in Austria, in 1876 Frankel returned to his home city of Budapest and began establishing the ideological and organization groundwork for what became the *Magyarországi Általános Munkáspárt* (General Workers' Party of Hungary). As part of these efforts, Frankel edited the *Munkás Heti Krónika* (Workers' Weekly Chronicle) from 1876–1876 and then the *Arbeiter Wochen-Kronik*. His work for these journals brought him into conflict with the Habsburg authorities, who arrested him in 1881 for violating the press laws. Frankel spent over two years in jail before his release in 1884.[34]

Following his release, Frankel divided his time between doing organizational work for various socialist groups in Vienna, Budapest, and Paris. In June 1885 in Paris Frankel met Theodor Herzl through a common acquaintance. Though Herzl had not yet

---

[32]Eichner, 162.
[33]"Letter, Friedrich Engels to Karl Marx, August 23, 1871," *Collected Works 44*, 203.
[34]Emile Tersen, "La carrière militante de Leo Frankel," in *Cahiers Internationaux, Revue Internationale du Monde du Travail*, 16 (May 1950): 42–44.

developed his ideas of Zionism, his views on nationality and nationalism held little appeal to the deeply internationalist Frankel, and the two did not get along.[35] Frankel settled permanently in Paris in 1889, aiding Engels with the organization of the Second International. His renewed activities in Paris illustrate that while it no longer constituted a revolutionary center, the French capital's revolutionary legacy combined with its status as one of Europe's great cities still marked it as an important site for radical organizing. Between 1890 and 1895 Frankel represented the Hungarian workers at several Congresses. However, in 1895 his health began to fail, leading him to retire from his activities for the International. Even in his retirement Frankel still participated actively in commemorations of the Commune, organizing a rally on March 18, 1895, in honor of its 24th anniversary. This fittingly proved his last major political act; in January 1896 he fell ill and, after lingering several weeks, died on March 29. His funeral drew thousands on April 2, as he was carried to Père Lachaise and interred wrapped in a red flag. Though laid to rest in Paris, in 1968 for reasons not readily clear his body was removed to Budapest and buried by the Communist government in the Workers' Pantheon.[36]

The intent of this project has been to demonstrate how Paris, beginning with the French Revolution, became a site of revolutionary pilgrimage for international radicals drawn by its promise of facilitating their own political and ideological aspirations. Inaugurated by the Great Revolution, this process greatly accelerated between 1830 and 1848 as the city's community of foreign radicals, spurred by the growth of transnational discourse such as socialism, began to perceive Paris's revolutionary portent as

---

[35]Raphael Patai, *The Jews of Hungary: History, Culture, Psychology* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996), 366.
[36]Tersen, 44.

transnational and exportable. Though the efforts of 1848 proved a failure, they served to illustrate to the non-French radical community in Paris that a truly transnational revolutionary effort could only be facilitated by first consolidating revolution in Paris. This, combined with the deepening of transnational radical ties through the establishment of the International, produced the conditions whereby Paris's transnational potential reached its apex with the Paris Commune. The experiences of Leo Frankel, Elisabeth Dmitrieff, and Jaroslav Dombrowski illustrate how foreign radicals came to view the Commune as the historical moment capable of carrying Paris's revolutionary promise to its final fulfilment. Although the Herculean efforts to realize this new world proved unable to overcome the forces arrayed against them, they still created, if only for a moment, a vision of the possible; a pathway beginning in Paris to an emancipatory future for Europe and beyond.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Archives Nationales-Paris, France

Bibliothèque nationale de France-Paris, France

Periodicals

Le Combat

Le Cri du Peuple

Egalite

La Montagne

Neue Rheinische Zeitung

La Réforme Sociale

Réveil

La Sociale

Sozialdemokraten

Primary Sources, Collections, and Official Documents

Arnould, Arthur. *Histoire populaire et parlementaire de la Commune de Paris.* New York: AMS Press, 1978.

Association Internationale des Travailleurs. *Séances officielles de l'Internationale Paris pendant la Commune—Procès verbaux*. Paris: 1872.

Bakunin, Mikhail. *The Confession of Mikhail Bakunin: with the Marginal Comments of Tsar Nicholas I*. trans. Robert C. Howes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Chernyshevsky, Nikolay. *What is to Be Done? Tales About New People*. London:Virago, 1982.

Christie, Thomas. *Letters on the Revolution of France.* London: 1791.

Cluseret, Gustave-Paul. *Mémoires du Général Cluseret.* Paris: Levy, 1887.

The Collected Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft. Edited by Janet Todd. New York: Columbia UP, 2003.

Colton, Charles Caleb. *Narrative of the French Revolution in 1830: An Authentic Detail of the Events which Took Place on the 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th of July*. Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1830.

The Communards of Paris, 1871. Edited by Stewart Edwards. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1973.

da Costa, Gaston. *La Commune Vécue: 18 mars-28 mai 1871.* Paris: Ancienne Maison, 1905.

Documents of the First International: The General Council of the First International 1864–72, Minutes. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1962.

Dombrowski, Jaroslav. *Trochu Comme Organisateur et Général en Chef.* Paris: Club des révolutionnaires, 1871.

"The French Republic Constitution of 1793." in *On Civil Liberty and Self-Government*, 3rd revised edition. ed. Theodore D. Woolsey. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1883.

The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History. ed. Lynn Hunt. Bedford/St. Martins: Boston, 1996.

Garibaldi, Giuseppe. *Autobiography of Giuseppe Garibaldi*. vol. III, trans. A. Werner. New York: Howard Fertig, 1971.

de Goncourt, Edmond. *Paris under siege, 1870-1871: From the Goncourt Journal*. ed. George Becker. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Guillaume, James. *L'Internationale, Doucments et souvenirs (1864-1878).* vol. 2. Paris: P.V. Stock, 1905.

Heine, Heinrich. *De la France.* Paris: Calmann Levy, 1884.

Hugo, Victor. *Quatre-Vingt-Treize.* New York: Libraire Français, 1896.

Journal Officiel de la Commune de Paris du 20 mars au 24 mai 1871 (Paris, 1872)

Lassalle, Ferdinand. *Der Arbeiter-Programm*. London: The Modern Press, 1884.

Lefrancais, Gustave. *Etude sur la movement Communaliste a Paris en 1871*. Paris: Edhis, 1968.

_____. *Souvenirs d'un Révolutionnaire*. Paris: Société encyclopédique française, 1972.

Leroux, Pierre. *De l'égalité précédé de De l'individualisme et du socialism*. Paris: Slatkine, 1996.

Les Murailles Politiques Français. Paris: Chevalier, 1875.

Lettres de communards et de militants de la Ire Internationale à Marx, Engels et autres, dans les journées de la Commune de Paris en 1871. Edited by Jules Rocher. Paris: Bureau d'Editions, 1934.

Lissagaray, Propser-Olivier. *L'histoire de la commune de 1871*. Paris: Dentu, 1896.

_____. *Les Huit journées de mai derrière les barricades*. Paris: Éditions d'histoire sociale, 1968.

Longuet, Jenny Marx, Lafargue, Laura Marx, and Aveling, Eleanor Marx. *The Daughters of Karl Marx: Family Correspondence, 1866-1898*. Edited by Olga Meier, translated by Faith Evans. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.

Malon, Benoît. *La Troisième défaite du prolétariat Français*. Paris: Éditions d'histoire sociale, 1968.

Marx, Karl. *The Class Struggles in France: From the February Revolution to the Paris Commune.* Chippendale: Resistance Books, 2003.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. *Collected Works, Volume 6, 1845–48*. New York, International Publishers, 1976.

_____. *Collected Works: Volume 43, Marx and Engels 1868–1870*. New York: International Publishers, 1988.

_____. *Collected Works: Volume 44, Marx and Engels 1870-1873*. New York: International Publishers, 1989.

_____. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York: Norton, 1978.

_____. *The Russian Menace to Europe*. Edited by Paul Blackstock and Bert Hoselitz. London: Unwin, 1953.

Marx, Karl and Lenin,V.I. *Civil War in France: The Paris Commune*. Edited by Nikita Fedorovsky. New York: International, 1993.

Michel, Louise. *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel*. edited and translated by Bullitt Lowry and Elisabeth Gunter. Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1981.

_____. *La Commune*. Paris: P.V. Stock, 1898.

The Paris Commune of 1871: The View from the Left. Edited by Eugene Schulkind. New York: Grove, 1974.

Proces-Verbaux de la Commune de Paris: Edition Critique. vols 1 and 2. Edited by Georges Bourgin and Gabriel Henriot. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1924.

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph. *What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government.* New York: Dover, 1970.

Rossel, Louis. *Rossel's Posthumous Papers*. Translated by anonymous. London: Chapman and Hall, 1872.

Sarrans, Bernard Alexis. *Memoirs of General Lafayette and of the French revolution of 1830, Volume 2.* London: Bentley, 1832.

Les séances officielles de l'Internationale à Paris / pendant le siége et pendant la Commune. Paris: Lachuard, 1872.

Senisse, Martial. *Le Carnets d'un Federe de la Commune 1871.* Edited by J.A Faucher. Paris: Collective, 1965.

Swiatkowski, W. *Les Polonais et La Commune de Paris.* Paris: Librairie Générale, 1876.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Alexis de Tocqueville on Democracy, Revolution, and Society*. Edited by John Stone and Stephen Mennell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

_____. *The Old Regime and the Revolution.* trans. John Bonner. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1856.

Turnbull, David. *The French Revolution of 1830: The Events which Produced It, and the Scenes by which it was Accompanied.* London: Boston and Palmers, 1830.

Varlin, Eugene. *Pratique militante Ecrits d'un ouvier communard*. Paris: Francois Maspero, 1977.

Villetard, Edmond. *Histoire De L'Internationale*. Paris, Kessinger, 1872.

Washburne, Elihu Benjamin. *Recollections of a Minister to France: 1869–1877*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1887.

Williams, Helen Maria. *Letters Written in France in the Summer of 1790*, 4th Edition. London, 1794.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Man.* London, 1790.

Wolowski, Bronislaw. *Dombrowski et Versailles.* Geneva: Carey, 1871.

Secondary Sources

Alger, John Goldworth. *Englishmen in the French Revolution.* London: St. Dunstan's House, 1889.

Amann, Peter. "A 'Journée' in the Making: May 15, 1848." *The Journal of Modern History* 42, no. 1 (Mar., 1970): 42–69.

Aranyossi, Magda. *Leo Frankel*. Berlin: Dietz, 1957.

Association des Amis de la Commune de Paris, 1871. *Leo Frankel: "le premier Ministre du travail du premier gouvernement ouvrier."* Paris: Association des Amis de la Commune, 1996.

Beck, Hermann. "Working-Class Politics at the Crossroads of Conservatism, Liberalism and Socialism." In *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990.* Edited by David Barclay and Eric Weitz, 63-86. New York: Berghahn Books, 1998.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment.* New York: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Billington, James. *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith.* New York: Basic Books, 1980.

Blaison, Louis. *Un Passage de vive force du Rhin français en 1848.* Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1933.

Bourgin, Georges. "1848 en Europe." In *1848: Le livre du centenaire."* Edited by Charles Moulin, 81-108. Paris: Atlas, 1948.

Bradley, Ken. *International Brigades in Spain, 1936–39*. Oxford: Osprey, 1994.

Braibant, Sylvie. *Elisabeth Dmitrieff: aristocrate et pétroleuses.* Paris: Belfond, 1993.

Brubaker, Rodgers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Bruhat,Jean, Emile Tersen, Hélène Gosset, and Vassili Soukomline. "Le Mouvement Ouvrier International et la Commune de Paris." *Cahiers Internationaux, Revue Internationale du Monde du Travail* 16 (May, 1950): 35–62.

Carr, E.H. *Michael Bakunin.* New York: Octagon, 1975.

Canevali, Ralph. "The 'French False Alarm': Revolutionary Panic in Baden, 1848." *Central European History*, 18, no. 2 (Jun., 1985): 119–42.

Clavin, Patricia. “Defining Transnationalism.” *Contemporary European History* 14, no. 4 (2005): 421–39.

Cornu, August. *Karl Marx et Friedrich Engels. Vol. 3, Marx à Paris.* Paris: PUF, 1962.

Dautry, Jean and Scheler, Lucien, *Le Comité Central Républicain des vingt arrondissements de Paris (septembre 1870–mai 1871)*. Paris: Editions Sociales, 1960.

Delphine, Daiz.“Les réfugiés politiques étrangers dans la France des années 1830: De la redéfinition des figures d'autorité à la contestation des norms.” *Hypothèses* 15, no. 1 (2011): 267–78.

Diakov, V.A. “Communications: La Commune de Paris et les Peuples Slaves.” *Le Mouvement Social* 79, La Commune de 1871 Actes du colloque universitaire pour la commémoration du centenaire Paris, les 21–22–23 mai 1971 (April/June 1972): 247–59.

Dommanget, Maurice. *Hommes et choses du temps de la Commune, récits et portraits pour servir à l'histoire de la première révolution sociale*. Paris: Éditions d’histoire sociale, 1968.

Droz, Jacques. *Les révolutions allemandes de 1848*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957.

Drozd, Andrew. *Chernyshevsky's What is To Be Done: A Reevaluation.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1986.

Dubois, Raoul. *A l'Assaut du Ciel—: la Commune Racontée.* Paris: les éditions ouvrières, 1991.

Edwards, Stuart. *The Paris Commune, 1871*. New York: Quadrangle, 1971.

Efremova, N. and N. Invanov. *Russkaia Soratnitsa Marksa.* Moscow: Moskovskii Rabochii, 1982.

Eichner, Carolyn J. *Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The First Professional Revolutionist: Filippo Michele Buonarroti*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Engel, Barbara. *Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth Century Russia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Ereny,Tibor. “La Commune de Paris et le Mouvement Ouvrier Hongrois.” *Europe* 29 (Apr 1, 1951): 64–65.

Espagne, Michel and Michael Werner. *Les Relations interculturelles dans l’espace franco-allemand (XVIIIe et XIXe siecle).* Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1988.

_____.“Kulturtransfer und Fachgeschichte der Geisteswissenschaften.” *Comparativ* 10 (2000): 42-61.

_____. “Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle.” *Genèses* 17 (1994): 112-121.

Essays on Karamzin: Russian Man-of-Letters, Political Thinker, Historian, 1766–1826. ed. Joseph Laurence Black and Nikolaĭ Mikhaĭlovich Karamzin. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Foulon, Maurice. *Eugène Varlin, relieur et membre de la Commune*. Clermont-Ferrand: Éditions Mont-Louis, 1934.

Freifeld, Alice. *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848–1914*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Freitag, Sabine. "Introduction." In *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England*. Edited by Sabine Freitag, 1-18. London: Berghahn, 2003.

Fruchtman, Jack. *Thomas Paine: Apostle of Freedom.* London: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1994.

Furet, Francois. *Revolutionary France: 1770–1880.* London: Blackwell, 1995.

Gallard, Jeanne. *Paris la Ville, 1852–1870.* Paris: L'Harmattan, 1997.

Gooch, George Peabody. *Germany and the French Revolution.* New York: Longmans, 1920.

Gould, Roger. *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Grandjonc, Jacques. "Eléments statistiques pour une étude de l'immigration étrangère en France de 1830 à 1851." *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 15 (1971): 211–300.

Granine, Daniel. *Dombrowsky.* Translated by Georges Arout. Paris: Les Éditeurs Français Réunis, 1956.

Gullickson, Gay L. *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Commune.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Harsin, Jill. *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830–1848.* New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Harvey, David. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

The History of Poland Since 1863. Edited by R.F. Leslie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848*. New York: Vintage, 1996.

Horne, Alistar. *The Fall of Paris: The Siege and the Commune 1870–1*. London: MacMillan, 1965.

House, Jonathan Mallory. *Controlling Paris: Armed Forces and Counter-revolution, 1789–1848.* New York: New York University Press, 2014.

Howard, Michael. *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Invasion of France 1870–1871*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Jemnitz, János. "Leo Frankel." *International Review of Social History* 17 (April 1972): 391–94.

Johnson, Martin. *The Paradise of Association: Political Culture and Popular Organizations in the Paris Commune of 1871*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Judt, Tony. *Marxism and the French Left: Studies in Labor and Politics in France, 1830–1981*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

Kafker, F.A. "Paris, centre principal de l'entreprise Encyclopédie." in *Paris et la Révolution.* Edited by Michel Vovelle. Paris: Publications De La Sorbonne, 1989.

Keane, John. *Thomas Paine: A Political Life.* Grove: New York, 2003.

Kisluk, Eugene J. *Brothers from the North: The Polish Democratic Society and the European Revolutions of 1848–49.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Knizhnik-Vetrov, Ivan. *Russkie deiatel'nitsky Pervogo Internatsionala I Parizhskoi Kummuny.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1964.

Kramer, Lloyd S. *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830–1848.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Lingelbach, Gabriele. "Intercultural Transfer and Comparative History: The Benefits and Limits of Two Approaches." Translated by Isabelle Rispler, Karen Beasley, Lana Rings, and Jacqueline Zeledon. *Traversea* 1 (2011): 46–59.

Mason, Edward. *The Paris Commune: An Episode in the History of the Socialist Movement.* New York: Howard Fertig, 1967.

Mathiez, Albert. *La Révolution et les Etrangers: cosmopolitisme et défense nationale.* Paris: La Renaissance du livre, 1918.

McClellan, Woodford. *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune.* London: Frank Cass, 1979.

Milza, Pierre. *L'Année terrible: La Commune mars-juin 1871*.Paris, Perrin, 2009.

de Molinari,Gustave. *Les Club rouges pendant la Siege du Paris.* Paris: Garnier, 1871.

Monas, Sidney. *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Moss, Moss. *The Origins of the French Labor Movement, 1830–1914: The Socialism of Skilled Workers*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1980.

_____. "Marx and Engels on French Social Democracy: Historians or Revolutionaries?" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46, No. 4 (Oct.–Dec., 1985): 539–57.

_____. "Marx and the Permanent Revolution in France: Background to the Communist Manifesto." In *The Communist Manifesto Today: The Socialist Register, 1998*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998, 147–67.

Nimtz, August. *Marx and Engels: Their Contribution to the Democratic Breakthrough.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

O'Brien, Conor Cruise. "Nationalism and the French Revolution." In *The Permanent Revolution: The French Revolution and its Legacy, 1789–1989*. Edited by Geoffrey Best. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Orr, William J., Jr. "East Prussia and the Revolution of 1848." *Central European History* 13, No. 4 (Dec., 1980): 303–31.

Patai, Raphael. *The Jews of Hungary: History, Culture, Psychology*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.

Paulmann, Johannes. "Internationaler Vergleich und interkultureller Transfer: Zwei Forschungsansätze zur europäischen Geschichte des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts." *Historische Zeitschrift* 267, no. 3 (1998): 649–85.

Pilbeam, Pamela. *The 1830 Revolution in France*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

_____. *French Socialists Before Marx: Workers, Women and the Social Question in France.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

Ponteil, Felix. *1848*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1955.

Rapport, Michael. *Nationality and Citizenship in Revolutionary France: The Treatment of Foreigners 1789–1799.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Robertson, Priscilla. *Revolutions of 1848: A Social History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Rougerie, Jacques. *Paris insurgé: la Commune de 1871*. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.

_____. "L'A.I.T. et le mouvement ouvrier à Paris pendant les événements de 1870–1871." *International Review of Social History* 17, no. 1 (April 1972): 3–102.

_____. *Paris Libre*. Seuil: Paris, 1971.

_____."La Première Internationale a Lyon (1865–1870)." *Anali: Ann Quarto 1961*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1962.

_____. *Procès des Communards*. Paris: Julliard, 1964.

_____. "Quelques documents nouveau pour l'histoire du Comite Central Republicain des Vingt Arrondissements." *Le Mouvement Social* 37 (1961): 3–29.

Rożałowski, Włodzimierz. *Wspomnienia o generale Jarosławie Dąbrowskim*. Wydawn: Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej, 1951.

Sahlins, Peter. *Unnaturally French: Foreign Citizens in the Old Regime and After.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Saunier, Pierre-Yves. "Learning by Doing: Notes about the Making of the Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History." *Journal of Modern European History* 6, no. 2 (2008): 159–80.

Serman, William. *La Commune de Paris*. Paris; Fayard, 1986.

Sewell, William H. *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Shafer, David. A. *The Paris Commune: French Politics, Culture and Society at the Crossroads of the Revolutionary Tradition and Revolutionary Socialism.* New York: Palgrave, 2005.

Simms, J.G. "The Irish on the Continent, 1691–1800." In *A New History of Ireland*, iv. *Eighteenth Century Ireland 1691–1800.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Singer-Lecocq, Yvonne. *Rouge Elisabeth*. Paris: Editions Stock, 1977.

Smith, Michael Peter. *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.

Soboul, Albert. *The French Revolution 1787–1799: From the Storming of the Bastille to Napoleon.* Vintage: New York, 1974.

Sperber, Jonathan. *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press, 2005.

_____. "Echoes of the French Revolution in the Rhineland, 1830–1849." *Central European History* 22 (1989): 200–17.

Stadelmann, Rudolph. *Social, and Political History of the German 1848 Revolution.* Athens: Ohio University Press, 1975.

Stites, Richard.*The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism, 1860–1930*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Stoler, Ann Laura and Cooper, Frederic. "Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda." in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois*

World. Edited by Ann Laura Stoler and Frederic Cooper, 1-58. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Taithe, Bertrand. *Citizenship and Wars: France in Turmoil 1870–71*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Thomas, Edith. *The Women Incendiaries*. New York: George Braziller, 1966.

_____. *Louise Michel; ou, La velleda de l'anarchie.* Paris: Gallimard, 1971.

_____. "The Woman of the Commune." *The Massachusetts Review* 12, no. 3 (Summer, 1971): 409–17.

Tilly, Charles and Lees, Lynn. "Le peuple de Juin 1848." *Annales* XXIX (1974): 1061–91.

Tombs,Robert. *The Paris Commune, 1871*. London: Longman, 1999.

_____. "Inventing Politics: From Bourbon Restoration to Republican Monarchy" In *French History since Napoleon*. Edited by Martin Alexander, 59-79. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Traugott, Mark. *The Insurgent Barricade.* Berkley: University of California Press, 2010.

Ulan, Adam. *Prophets and Conspirators in Prerevolutionary Russia.* New Brunswick: Transaction, 1998.

Vallentin, Antonina. *Heine: Poet in Exile*. trans. Harrison Brown. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1956.

Verhoeven, Claudia. *The Odd Man Karakozov: Imperial Russia, Modernity, and the Birth of Terrorism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Vincent, K. Steven. *Between Marxism and Anarchism: Benoit Malon and French Reformist Socialism.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1992.

Wahnich, Sophie. *L'impossible Citoyen: L'étranger dans le discours de la Révolution française.* Paris: Albin Michel, 1997.

Wandycz, Piotr Stefan. *The Lands of Partitioned Poland, 1795–1918*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984.

Waldman, Martin R. "The Revolutionary as Criminal in 19th Century France: A Study of Communards and Deportees." *Science and Society XXXVII*, no. 1 (1973): 31–55.

Wardle, Ralph Martin. *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Critical Biography*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Werner, Michael and Zimmermann, Bénédicte. "Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity." *History and Theory* 45, no.1 (2006): 30–50.

Williams, Roger. *The French Revolution of 1870–71*. New York: Norton, 1969.

Wolfe, Robert. *The Origins of the Paris Commune. The Popular Organizations of 1868–1871*. PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1966.

Wright, Gordon. "The Anti-Commune: Paris, 1871." *French Historical Studies* 10, no. 1 (Spring, 1977): 149–72.